# THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

By

O. T. Hargrave

Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
Religion

June, 1966
Nashville, Tennessee

| Approved: | Date: |
|---|---|
| | 16 May 1966 |
| PHHardacre | 16 May 1966. |

# PREFACE

On the surface few things would seem to be less interesting than the details of ancient theological controversies. And yet, the more one delves into the issues which moved men's minds in centuries past, the more one comes to realize how truly universal and timeless many of them are. This at least has been my happy experience with the present study.

Initially I set out with the intention of focusing the study on the seventeenth century, and specifically the disputes concerning predestination which during the first half of that century so frequently occupied the center stage of theological developments in England. But the deeper I became involved in the background, the more I came to realize how very little had been done on the topic in the preceding century--the formative period in so many ways for the Anglican tradition. And the more I examined the source materials, the more I became convinced that many of the assumptions about the earlier period were in fact false and quite incapable of being substantiated. For these reasons I came to the conclusion that the more valuable contribution could be made by directing my efforts toward the sixteenth century. Consequently I redefined my task thereafter as one of tracing the development of the doctrine of predestination through the classical period of the English Reformation--from the middle of the reign of

King Henry VIII through the middle of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I.

As for the materials used, I have of course profited much from the work of other scholars--historians and biographers of the Tudor period in particular. But my chief concentration has always been upon the sources themselves. And, insofar as has been possible within the structure of this kind of study, I have allowed the sources to speak for themselves--hence the occasional preponderance of quoted material in the pages that follow. I defend this approach not only on the basis that the words of the original are more convincing and often more interesting than those of a paraphrased summary, but also on the principle that by so doing the tendency to impose dogmatic interpretations and applications upon the materials is considerably lessened.

By way of acknowledgements, there are many persons and institutions to whom I am indebted for aid in the preparation of this study. My gratitude goes forth especially to my Readers, Professors Paul H. Hardacre, Harry C. Porter, and Egon W. Gerdes, and to the other members of my Committee whose generous help and stimulating interest have been a constant source of encouragement. I am also grateful to the Board of Directors of the Fund for Theological Education and to the Master and College Council of Churchill College, Cambridge, for awards (a Rockefeller Doctoral Fellowship and a Ford Research Studentship) which made possible a year of research and study at Cambridge University in England. I express my appreciation further for the kind and

useful service given by the librarians and staffs of many libraries--specifically those of the Joint University Libraries in Nashville, Tennessee, the University Library in Cambridge, the University of Florida Library in Gainesville, and the Florida Southern College Library in Lakeland. And for invaluable aid rendered in proofreading and typing the various manuscripts of this dissertation, my thanks go no less to my wife Patsy.

Finally, I have taken the liberty of modernizing the spelling in quotations from sixteenth-century materials. I have, however, left titles in their original form.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ii

INTRODUCTION. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Chapter

I. THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION AMONG THE HENRICIAN REFORMERS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 5

- A. The Exiled Reformers
  - 1. William Tyndale
  - 2. John Frith
  - 3. Robert Barnes
  - 4. George Joye vs. Stephen Gardiner
- B. The Henrician Formularies
  - 1. The Bishop's Book
  - 2. The King's Book
- C. Translations into English: Erasmus Sacerius

II. THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION AMONG THE EDWARDIAN REFORMERS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 33

- A. The Major Edwardian Reformers
  - 1. Thomas Cranmer
  - 2. John Hooper
  - 3. Bartholomew Traheron
  - 4. Hugh Latimer
  - 5. Thomas Becon
- B. Developments in Kent
  - 1. John Lamberd
  - 2. The Rise of the Freewillers
- C. Translations into English and the Continental Theologians in England
  - 1. Translations of Augustine
  - 2. The Continental Theologians in England
    - a. Martin Bucer
    - b. Bernardino Ochino
    - c. Peter Martyr Vermigli
- D. The Edwardian Formularies
  - 1. The First Book of Homilies
  - 2. The Edwardian Prayer Books
  - 3. The Edwardian Primer
  - 4. The Edwardian Catechism
  - 5. The Forty-Two Articles
  - 6. The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws

III. THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION AMONG THE MARIAN PROTESTANTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 97

- A. The Predestinarian Controversy Among the Prisoners for Religion
  - 1. The Parties and the Outbreak of the Controversy
  - 2. John Bradford and the Predestinarians
  - 3. John Trewe and the Freewillers
  - 4. Significance of the Controversy
- B. The Development of the Doctrine Among the Exiles for Religion
  - 1. An Anonymous Confession of Faith
  - 2. Justus Velsius and the Disturbances at Frankfort
  - 3. The Confession of Faith of the English Exiles at Geneva
  - 4. The Genevan Translation of the Bible
  - 5. William Whittingham and the Translation of Theodore de Beza
  - 6. Anthony Gilby
  - 7. John Knox vs. an Anonymous Anabaptist

IV. THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE EARLY ELIZABETHAN CHURCH . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 156

- A. Continuation of the Moderate Tradition
  - 1. The Major Elizabethan Churchmen
    - a. Matthew Parker
    - b. John Jewel
    - c. John Whitgift
    - d. John Foxe
    - e. Alexander Nowell
    - f. Thomas Rogers
  - 2. The Elizabethan Formularies
    - a. The Elizabethan Prayer Book and the Second Book of Homilies
    - b. The Thirty-Nine Articles
- B. Advance of the Calvinist Tradition
  - 1. Early Controversial Writers
    - a. John Veron
    - b. (John Champneys)
    - c. Robert Crowley
  - 2. The Puritan Confessions of John Field and Thomas Wilcox
  - 3. Revisions of and Additions to the Geneva Bible
    - a. Laurence Tomson's New Testament and Annotations of 1576
    - b. The Catechism on Predestination of 1579

        4. Translations of Continental Theologians
            a. John Calvin
            b. Theodore de Beza
            c. Wolfgang Musculus
    C. Rise of the Anti-Calvinist Tradition
        1. John Champneys
        2. Thomas Talbot
        3. Antonio de Corro
        4. Peter Baro
        5. Samuel Harsnett
        6. Richard Hooker

CONCLUSION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 235

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 248

# INTRODUCTION

"The one definite thing which can be said about the Reformation in England," writes the eminent British historian Sir Frederick Maurice Powicke, "is that it was an act of state."[1] While this is certainly true in the sense in which it was intended, unfortunately statements of this sort have too generally been taken to imply that the English Reformation, in contrast with its continental counterparts, was devoid of theological developments of significance. There were, as a matter of fact, theological contributions of considerable importance associated with the Reformation in England, and to ignore them is to fail to understand the period properly and completely.

This is not to say that the English reformers were first-class theologians. For the most part their writings were not distinguished by any great originality or depth of theological perception. Nevertheless in their own way, at one time or another, they did manage to cover most of the key theological issues of the day.

One such issue was the doctrine of predestination. From the earliest periods of Christian thought this doctrine had been a highly significant if controversial one. Saint Augustine had given much of his time in consideration of its implications, and indeed the doctrine had been one of the key issues in Augustine's celebrated dispute with the British monk Pelagius. Relatively neglected during the Middle Ages, the doctrine came to the fore again in the time of the Protestant Reformation. Most of the chief continental reformers, in line with their renewed emphasis upon the role of divine grace in salvation, incorporated the concept into their theological systems. They differed widely, however, as to its specific interpretation, and the issue eventually became one of the two or three chief points of controversy within continental Protestant theology.

---

[1] Frederick Maurice Powicke, The Reformation in England (London: The Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 1.

Predestination was also dealt with by the English reformers. Most of the major churchmen, and a surprising number of the minor ones, dealt with the doctrine in one form or another. To be sure, the issue only upon occasion--and that towards the latter part of the period--became the major one that it was on the continent; but even so it consistently absorbed more than its share of the energies of the theological writers of England.

The purpose of this study then is to focus upon this one key doctrine, and to trace its development through the course of the English Reformation.

There are many benefits to be gained from such an examination--some of them more obvious than others. In the first place, such a study provides an insight precisely into that theological side of the English Reformation which all too frequently is ignored. While the doctrine of predestination was not the chief concern of English theology (as has already been suggested), it certainly represents one important and perhaps typical chapter in that regard.

In the second place, it throws considerable light upon the character and extent of outside influences upon English thought. Such influences were consistently strong and often determinative in connection with the doctrine of predestination, ranging from a basic Augustinianism through all the major continental Protestant traditions. To look at the impact of these influences is to study one of the truly formative factors in English Reformation theology.

In the third place, it supplies the background and orientation essential to a proper understanding of the crucial predestinarian developments which took place in England in the seventeenth century. Those later and often more celebrated developments were not at all unrelated to what transpired in the previous century; and to examine closely this background is to lay the foundations for the reinterpretation of much that came later.

In the fourth place, it serves to illuminate some of the lesser-known movements and personalities of sixteenth-century English history. To trace the development of the doctrine of predestination in Reformation England is to move not infrequently off the familiar and beaten path and to explore some previously overlooked and neglected areas. Such activity cannot help but result in a broadening of the total knowledge of the period.

Finally, the study furnishes yet one more chapter in the long history of that dispute concerning the relation between divine sovereighty and human responsibility which has been such a lively part of the Western Christian tradition from its inception even to the present day. The developments in England, as has already been pointed out, did not occur within a vacuum; rather they are most properly understood within the context of this broader and perhaps ageless predestinarian debate.

The procedure of the study then is to trace, describe, analyze, and evaluate the development of the doctrine of predestination in the tracts, treatises, commentaries, confessions, religious manuals, and other printed materials produced either privately or by official authority during the Reformation in England. The study will begin with the reign of King Henry VIII and will procede by reigns through the middle of that of Queen Elizabeth I--the most commonly accepted scope of the English Reformation as such, and the period during which the basic themes, tendencies, and patterns with regard to the development of the doctrine of predestination were firmly established.

Finally, in any study of this sort a certain knowledge of related materials on the part of the reader is assumed. In this case little time is spent upon the details of the prior development of the doctrine of predestination in the history of Christian though, or upon the broader political, social, and religious aspects of the English Reformation. The literature in both of these areas is not only extensive, but also quite generally well known.

# CHAPTER I

# THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION AMONG THE HENRICIAN REFORMERS

The English Reformation is generally said to have had its origin in the reign of King Henry VIII. It was during that period that the ties between the English Church and the Roman jurisdiction were suspended and Christianity in England began to move in a Protestant direction.

This is not to say that Henry himself was a Protestant. For while he personally initiated and directed the break with the papacy, he was willing to countenance little if any change in such areas as theology and liturgy. His ecclesiastical policy was in essence one of schism without heresy--a policy which served during most of his reign to keep in check tendencies toward excessive reforming zeal.

## The Exiled Reformers

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that many of the more advanced of the English reformers found their progressive theological opinions incompatible with the religious climate in England. Indeed, a small group of religious exiles were forced to live abroad because of their advanced Protestant faith. From their continental bases these reformers worked, in somewhat loose association, toward the common goal of a reformed Church in England. Indeed, the origins of the English Reformation as a theological movement may be said to have revolved in great measure around this exile operation.

Chief among these Henrician religious exiles, and in a sense the leader of the group, was William Tyndale, best known for his translations of the Bible. Others included John Frith, Robert Barnes, and George Joye. With the exception of the latter, each of these reformers eventually suffered martyrdom for the Protestant cause.

As exiled reformers, Tyndale and his associates were naturally thrown into contact with the leaders and ideas of the Protestant Reformation on the continent. Their association with the Lutheran movement in Germany was especially close and extensive. Indeed, it was in large measure from Lutheran sources that the exiles acquired their Protestant theology; and to look upon the group itself as English Lutherans probably would not be stretching the matter too far.

In view of these facts, it is not surprising that the earliest expressions of predestinarian views in the English Reformation occurred within the writings of this exile group. For while the doctrine of justification by faith was the main lesson learned from the Lutherans, the supporting doctrine of predestination, also an important Lutheran tenet, was not altogether overlooked. And happily this Lutheran influence was complemented by a direct familiarity with the predestinarian writings of Saint Augustine, an important influence upon English theology from well before the sixteenth century. In fact, much of the time the Lutheran influence itself consisted in little more than the mediation of basic Augustinian teachings via the Lutheran sources.

As early as 1526 William Tyndale was making reference to the doctrine of predestination in his Prologue upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, the greater part of which was a paraphrase, and at times a literal translation, of Martin Luther's Preface to the Romans. Tyndale's most extensive treatment of the doctrine, however, was included in The Parable of the Wicked Mammon of the following year. The primary theme of that treatise, which went through no fewer than eight editions by 1560, was the key Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith; and again it was in part a free translation from Luther. Tyndale's Answer unto Sir Thomas More's Dialogue, of 1530, also contained a short treatment of predestination under the caption, "The Manner and Order of Our Election"; and finally his Pathway into the Holy Scriptures, of c.1532, touched upon the doctrine in a few brief statements. At no point, however, did Tyndale present a sustained and systematic treatment of predestination. Consequently his ideas upon the subject emerge only in outline form.

"We are by inheritance heirs of damnation," Tyndale writes in The Parable of the Wicked Mammon. "Ere we be born, we are vessels of the wrath of God, and full of that poison whence naturally all sins spring, and wherewith we cannot but sin."[1] In his natural state man's will is inextricably bound up with that of the devil: "The devil is our Lord, and our ruler, our head, our governor, our prince, yea, and our god. And our will is locked and knit faster unto the will of the devil, than could an hundred thousand chains bind a man unto a post."[2] Unable thus to consent unto God, no man would be saved were his salvation dependent upon himself.

---

[1] William Tyndale, Doctrinal Treatises, and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures [Hereinafter referred to as Doctrinal Treatises], ed. Henry Walter (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1848), p. 64.

But "God chooseth them first, and they not God," Tyndale asserts.[3] From "before the world began" God has chosen from among mankind certain ones for his elect; and these he has "predestinate and ordained unto eternal life."[4] It is purely of God's mercy and at his good pleasure that these are chosen; in and of themselves they deserve no better fate than the rest of mankind.[5]

By means of this predestination "our justifying and salvation and salvation are clean taken out of our hands, and put in the hands of God only," Tyndale writes in paraphrase of Luther.[6] Then in typically

---

[2] A Pathway into the Holy Scripture, ibid., p. 17.

[3] An Answer unto Sir Thomas More's Dialogue, in An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue, The Supper of the Lord After the True Meaning of John VI and I Cor. XI, and Wm. Tracy's Testament Expounded [Hereinafter referred to as Answer to More], ed. Walter (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1850), p. 35.

[4] The Parable of the Wicked Mammon, in Doctrinal Treatises, p. 65.

[5] A Pathway into the Holy Scripture, in Doctrinal Treatises, p. 23.

[6] A Prologue upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, in Doctrinal Treatises, p. 505.

Augustinian fashion he describes the process whereby the Spirit of God works upon the hearts of the elect:

> When Christ is thuswise preached, and the promises rehearsed... then the hearts of them which are elect and chosen, begin to wax soft and melt at the bounteous mercy of God, and kindness shewed of Christ. For when the evangelion is preached, the Spirit of God entereth into them which God hath ordained and appointed unto eternal life; and openeth their inward eyes, and worketh such belief in them.[7]

It is God's Spirit then which "teacheth his children to believe."[8] "The will," he asserts, "hath none operation at all in the working of faith in my soul, no more than the child hath in the begetting of his father."[9]

In two especially striking passages Tyndale drives home his teaching by way of particular application, speaking of his own experience, then of that of the Penitent Thief:

> Now faith cometh not of our free will; but is the gift of God, given us by grace, ere there be any will in our hearts to do the law of God. And why God giveth it not every man, I can give no reckoning of his judgments. But well I wot, I never deserved it, nor prepared myself unto it; but ran another way clean contrary in my blindness, and sought not that way; but he sought me, and found me out, and shewed it me, and therewith drew me to him.[10]

> God did not see only that the thief, that was saved at Christ's death, should come thither; but God chose him, to shew his

---

[7] A Pathway into the Holy Scripture, in Doctrinal Treatises, p. 19.

[8] An Answer unto Sir Thomas More's Dialogue, in Answer to More, p. 139.

[9] Ibid., p. 140.

[10] Ibid., p. 192.

> mercy unto us that should after believe; and provided actually, and wrought for the bringing of him thither that day, to make him see and to receive the mercy that was laid up for him in store before the world was made.[11]

For Tyndale final salvation is certain and sure in the case of the elect. "Nothing," he writes, "is able to pluck him [the elect] out of the hands of God: God is stronger than all things."[12] The elect may sin and even upon occasion fall away, but they inevitably rise again, for they cannot be finally lost. Along this line Tyndale writes the following:

> And though God's elect cannot so fall that they rise not again, because that the mercy of God ever waiteth upon them, to deliver them from evil, as the care of a kind father waiteth upon his son, to warn him and to keep him from occasions, and to call him back again if he be gone too far; yet they forget themselves oft-times, and sink down into trances, and fall asleep in lusts for a season: but as soon as they be awaked, they repent, and come again without resistance.[13]

On the issue of the relationship between good works and election, Tyndale significantly sees himself following Luther as over against Augustine. For Tyndale good works serve in part as certification to the elect of election. Of course, they are in and of themselves the gift of God; but it is as the fruit of election that man receives the gift, and as such they serve to certify to him "that he is a true believer, and in the favour of God."[14] Good works are "the seal and mark, which God putteth on all men that he chooseth unto everlasting life."[15] Indeed, at one point Tyndale asserts that the elect were chosen "for because that we should do good works."[16] His view is summed up in the following somewhat remarkable passage:

---

[11] Ibid., p. 210.

[12] The Parable of the Wicked Mammon, in Doctrinal Treatises, p. 78.

[13] An Answer unto Sir Thomas More's Dialogue, in Answer to More, p. 36.

[14] The Parable of the Wicked Mammon, in Doctrinal Treatises, p. 61.

> Though thou canst laud God with thy lips, and call Christ Lord, and canst bable and talk of the scripture, and knowest all the stories of the bible, yet shalt thou thereby never know thine election, or whether thy faith be right. But and if thou feel lust in thine heart to the will of God, and bringest forth fruits thereof, then hast thou confidence and hope; and thy deeds, and also the Spirit whence thy deeds spring, certify thine heart that thou shalt enter, yea, art already entered, into the kingdom of heaven.[17]

This much Tyndale has to say about election. As for the negative side of predestination, he would discourage all inquiry: "Why doth God open one man's eyes and not another's? Paul forbiddeth to ask why; for it is too deep for man's capacity."[18] Nevertheless God's justice in predestination is to be defended:

> Now may not we ask why God chooseth one and not another; either think that God is unjust to damn us afore we do any actual deed; seeing that God hath power over all his creatures of right, to do with them what he list, or to make of every one of them as he listeth. Our darkness cannot perceive his light. God will be feared, and not have his secret judgments known....Let us therefore give diligence rather to do the will of God, than to search his secrets, which are not profitable for us to know.[19]

---

[15] Ibid., p. 79.

[16] Ibid., p. 77.

[17] Ibid., pp. 77-78.

[18] An Answer unto Sir Thomas More's Dialogue, in Answer to More, p. 191.

[19] The Parable of the Wicked Mammon, in Doctrinal Treatises, p. 89.

In fact, Tyndale would discourage the speculation of human reason about any aspect of the doctrine. He warns especially against "those unquiet, busy, and high-climbing spirits" who would "search the bottomless secrets of God's predestination, whether they be predestinate or not." Such inquiry can only lead to desperation.[20] Indeed, the doctrine of predestination is as a "strong wine." "Take heed therefore unto thyself," he warns, "that thou drink not wine while thou art yet but a suckling."[21]

John Frith, a close associate of Tyndale, had less to say about predestination. However, in his short treatise, A Mirrour or Glasse To Know Thyselfe, written probably in 1532, he did touch briefly upon the doctrine and related problems.

In the first place, Frith declares that all spiritual gifts, including "predestination, election, vocation and justification," come from God's mercy and favor alone.[22] He specifically rejects the view that God's predestination is based upon the foreknowledge of man's works, which view he attributes to his adversary, Sir Thomas More. In support of this rejection he appeals to Saint Paul, but even more especially to Augustine, to whom he makes vivid reference in this regard as a "candle which shall shine so bright, and so clearly dispel his [More's] mist and vain poetry, that you shall plainly perceive him dancing naked in a net, which notwithstanding thinketh himself to go invisible."[23] On this point he concludes that predestination "is neither of the works going before, nor of the works coming after, but only of the free favor of God."[24]

---

[20] A Prologue upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, in Doctrinal Treatises, p. 505.

[21] Ibid.

[22] John Frith, A Mirrour or Glasse To Know Thyselfe ([Antwerp?, 1533?]), [p. 3].

As for the question of "why he chooseth the one and repelleth the other," Frith warns with Augustine: "Enquire not...if thou wilt not err."[25] To this he adds the Pauline exclamation: "O the depth of the riches and wisdom of the knowledge of God, how unsearchable are his judgements, and how incomprehensible are his ways."

From the premise that man's election and salvation are thus committed solely to the hands of God, Frith, quite interestingly and quite uniquely, draws the inference that these gifts do not belong to the elect in an inalienable sense, but must be safeguarded and protected by efforts toward righteous living. "If he give thee faith in his word," he writes, "give him thanks, and bring forth the fruits thereof in due season, for else he will take it away from thee, and send thee into final desperation."[26] Along the same line he further writes,

> Truth it is that where faith is present, no sin can be imputed, but this faith is not in thy power, for it is the gift of God. And therefore if thou be unkind and endeavor not thyself to walk innocently, and to bring forth the fruits of

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid., [p. 4].

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid., [p. 13].

> faith, it is to be feared that for thine unkindness God will take it from thee...and then shall thine end be worse than thy beginning.[27]

Perseverance then would seem to be conditional upon the efforts and good works of the elect--a view somewhat at variance with the Augustinian teaching.

Robert Barnes, a third member of the Henrician exile group, similarly wrote rather sparingly about predestination. In a work published originally in 1531, entitled *A Supplicatyon Made by Robert Barnes, Doctoure in Divinite, unto the Most Excellent and Redoubted Prince Kinge Henrye the Eyght*, he included a treatise under the caption, "Free Will of Man, After the Fall of Adam of His Natural Strength, Can Do Nothing but Sin." In that treatise he approached at several points the problem of predestination.

Barnes' predestinarian views were closely bound up with his teaching concerning the bondage of the human will in matters spiritual. Indeed, that was the actual theme of his treatise. In typically Augustinian and Lutheran terms he asserts that "there is no good purpose in man, no good disposition, nor good intent." Of his own free will he "can do nothing...that is acceptable before God."[28] That some are saved then is to be attributed to God's grace and mercy, which enable the elect to receive the Gospel when it is preached, and which

---

[27] *Ibid.*, [p. 6].

[28] Robert Barnes, *A Supplicatyon Made by Robert Barnes, Doctoure in Divinite, unto the Most Excellent and Redoubted Prince Kinge Henrye the Eyght* ([Antwerp: S. Cock, 1531]), fols. lxxxviiia, lxxxia.

"taketh away his hardness, and giveth him a will to will all goodness."[29]

Barnes' primary contribution, surprisingly enough, has to do with his references to the negative side of predestination. Brief as they are they constitute the earliest direct treatment of that aspect of the doctrine among the English reformers, who all to frequently tend to ignore the problem, as will become increasingly clear.

Barnes speaks of "predestination, and of reprobation," clearly implying a two-sided doctrine. He frequently uses such words as "hardening" and "blinding," and makes reference to "the vessels of wrath, ordained to damnation."[30] In general, his understanding of reprobation seems to follow the Augustinian teaching of a passing by or a withholding of grace on the part of God, rather than that of a negative degree. He is most profuse, however, when he comes to the defense of God's activity in reprobation, within which context his ideas are most clearly expressed.

In the first place, Barnes will have it clearly understood that the why of reprobation is not a legitimate concern for men, as is seen in the following passage:

> Yea but yet sayst thou that he giveth the one mercy and giveth the other none. I answer what is that to thee? Is not his mercy his own? Is it not lawful for him to give it to whom he will?...For if it be his will to show his wrath, and to make his power known, over the vessels of wrath, ordained to damnation, and to declare the riches of his glory, unto the

---

[29] Ibid., fol. xciva.

[30] Ibid., fols. xcvia, xcva.

> vessels of mercy which he hath prepared and elected unto glory, what hast thou therewith to do? What cause hast thou thereof to complain? It is the will of God which can not be but well and righteous.[31]

He is equally clear, however, that while God gives his grace to some men and withholds it from others, when all men are equally undeserving, yet this is "not indifferently done."[32] God has his reasons which "he can tell you, if he would."[33] For men it should suffice that whatever God does must be righteous and just.

When the question is raised, why men should be punished by God for the sins which they cannot but commit, Barnes subtly evades the issue with a tirade against human reason: "Thou damnable reason, who can satisfy thee?"[34] Elsewhere he asks: "O thou blind and presumptuous, and damnable reason, where hast thou learned...to inquire a cause of thy maker's will? or else to murmur against the ordinance of thy living God? What hast thou to do to require a cause of his acts?"[35] Barnes adds the somewhat unique argument that, after all, men are not heard to complain when God gives them mercy undeservingly: "Why murmurest thou not that he hath made thee so good and so rightful, seeing thou hadst nothing deserved? But here wilt thou grant, that God did all things for the best. Why dost thou not likewise in other things?"[36]

---

[31] Ibid., fol. xcivb.

[32] Ibid., fol. xciva.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., fol. xciiib.

[35] Ibid., fol. lxxxvia.

Amid the discussion of such points, and almost without warning, Barnes interjects a striking exhortation to the believer: although "God saveth so few men, and damneth so many, and thou knowest no cause why, yet must thou believe that he is merciful and righteous."[37] He expands this note in the following passage:

> Wherefore leave off thy murmuring and thy disputation against God, and reckon that he is of his nature merciful, and hath no delight nor no pleasure in thy damnation; but believe thou steadfastly, that if he show his mercy, but unto one man in all the world that thou shalt be that same one man; and though an angel would make thee believe that all the world should be damned, yet stick thou fast to his mercy, and to his justice that justifieth thee, and believe that the sweet blood of his blessed Son cannot be shed in vain, but it must needs justify sinners and so many as stick fast unto it, though they be never so blinded and never so hardened, for it was shed alone for them.[38]

Finally, as for the cause of election, and reprobation as well, man's works or merits, both actual and foreseen, are specifically ruled out. Saint Paul knows but one cause--indeed, there can be but one cause, and that is "alonely the will of God."[39]

The importance of the role of predestination in the teaching of these early reformers is seen in the fact that their opinions did not go unnoticed by the more conservative or Catholic of the Henrician divines. In this regard, a relatively minor controversy on the issue between another of the Henrician exiles, George Joye, and the Henrician bishop, Stephen Gardiner, is a case in point. In fact, the character and extent of Gardiner's criticism would tend to imply that perhaps the doctrine was in the air more than references in the published materials of the period would suggest.[40]

---

[36] _Ibid._, fol. xciiib.

[37] _Ibid._, fol. xciva.

[38] _Ibid._, fol. xcivb.

[39] _Ibid._, fol. xcva.

In 1543 Joye published on the continent a rather brief attack upon Gardiner under the title, George Joye Confuteth Winchesters False Articles. Joye was for the most part concerned in the tract with establishing the doctrine of justification by faith, but he did include a couple of isolated and apparently incidental passages on predestination. The burden of Joye's argument was his accusation that Gardiner was a Pelagian, in that he attributed to man good works before justification. On predestination, he asserts simply that the elect are "chosen of God in Christ before the foundation of the world," and that they in due course are given faith, which gift "certifieth us of our election," than the knowledge of which there can be "nothing more excellent, sweeter, more full and perfect, wholsomer, more comfortable and joyous."[41]

---

[40] It is known, for instance, that the doctrine was a topic of student discussions around 1540, a short Latin essay on the subject by the Cambridge student James Pilkington surviving from the period. In 1546 Anne Askew, the Protestant heretic and martyr, emphasized the "reprobate" or "cast-away" theme; and as early as 1522 the poet John Skelton had made reference to those who "make epilogation, of high predestination." Cf., James Pilkington, The Works of James Pilkington, B.D., Lord Bishop of Durham, ed. James Scholefield (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1842), pp. 673-78; Anne Askew, The First Examinacyon of Anne Askewe, Latelye Martyred in Smythfelde, by the Romysh Popes Upholders, with the Elucydacyon of Johan Bale, ed. John Bale ([Wesel: D. van der Straten, 1546]), fol. 6a; and John Skelton, Here After Foloweth a Litel Boke Called Colyn Cloute (n.p.: R. Kele, [1545?]), [p. 24].

Gardiner answered Joye's attack three years later in A Declaration of Suche True Articles as George Joye Hath Gone About To Confute as False, which, while somewhat milder, was almost four times the length of Joye's treatise. Gardiner did not limit his reply to Joye alone, however, but made of it a general critique of "the new school of extremities," as he chose to designate the reformers.[42] This was especially true in the case of the doctrine of predestination.

From the outset Gardiner acknowledges predestination as a scriptural truth; but he feels that the "high mystery" has been "abused unseemly by naughty men."[43] Appealing frequently then to Saint John Chrysostom, and only occasionally to Augustine, he unleashes a lengthy criticism of the views espoused by the reformers.

To begin with Gardiner accuses the reformers of misunderstanding predestination when they think of it in temporal terms--in terms of an event accomplished in the past. They hold, he alleges, that God has in the past made his choice and rejection of men; but this, Gardiner maintains, leads inevitably to the nonscriptural and pagan position of a fatal necessity in the affairs of men. When God is said to have predestinated the elect "before the beginning of the world," what is meant is that this takes place, not in past time, but outside time altogether: "For these acts in God be without time, and above time." God "chooseth and predestinateth without any before or after, past or to come, which be only distinctions of time."[44]

---

[41] George Joye, George Joye Confuteth Winchesters False Articles (Wesill in Cliefe Lande [Antwerp?], 1543), fols. xixb-xxa.

[42] Stephen Gardiner, A Declaration of Suche True Articles as George Joye Hath Gone About To Confute as False (London: Johannes Herforde for R. Toye, 1546), fol. xxxvia.

[43] Ibid., fol. xxxixb.

What does take place in time, in Gardiner's view, is God's calling and justification of the elect. These, he allows, are in some way related to predestination, but the two stages or degrees of God's activity are not the same, as he accuses the reformers of teaching.

Just how predestination is related to processes occurring in time, such as calling and justification, is not at all clear. At times Gardiner seems to suggest that predestination only determines who shall receive the offer of salvation, the acceptance or rejection of the gift then being left up to man.[45] But what he is most sure of is that predestination, howsoever it works, does not in any way compromise the free will of man. The two somehow work together, although the explanation lies beyond the comprehension of man.

A primary source of the errors of the "new preachers," according to Gardiner, revolves around what he sees as their misuse of the Scriptures. They stress those texts which support their view, while ignoring those which go against it. But the Scriptures, Gardiner maintains, are not, as a matter of fact, so plain and clear on this point as the reformers would have men believe. The only proper way to handle the problem is by means of comparing and weighing together all the scriptural evidence. Applying this approach Gardiner reaches the following conclusion:

---

[44] Ibid., fols. lvia, lviiib.

[45] Ibid., fol. cxxxvib.

> And therefore likewise where scripture signifieth to me God's providence and predestination, which should seem to take away, and be repugnant to the free choice of man, forasmuch as the scriptures be nevertheless in that matter of free choice also evident, I must believe both to be true... although I can not set them together.[46]

Much of the thrust of Gardiner's critique actually revolves around his repeated insistence that predestination is God's secret and not a matter for human inquiry and comprehension. "We should only profess our ignorance," he says, "of the circumstances, how it is done...and so to worship the election and predestination of God in silence."[47] The overly curious "shall be ejected and cast out by the angel of God, and thrust into the darkness and blindness of our sensual reasoning"; he shall be confounded "with doubt upon doubt, as we can not tell what to say."[48]

The same year, 1546, Joye responded to Gardiner's answer in The Refutation of the Byshop of Winchesters Derke Declaration of His False Articles, Once Before Confuted by George Joye, which was double the length of Gardiner's work. On the issue of predestination Joye justly claimed that he had given no occasion for such a lengthy criticism, but that Gardiner had blindly stumbled into it, "but to declare only your ignorance, as ye say."[49] He was, in fact, somewhat irritated at having now "to digress and to contend with you in the matter," and suspected that Gardiner might deliberately have raised the new issue in order to divert attention from the main point of justification.[50]

---

[46] Ibid., fols. xlvib-xlviia.

[47] Ibid., fol. lixb.

[48] Ibid., fol. xliiia.

On the issue of necessity Joye unhesitatingly affirms that whomsoever God predestinates shall most assuredly be saved, "for God repenteth him not of his election, but it must necessarily and immutably come to pass." Indeed, "it lieth in no man's hands to resist his will nor to take any of his chosen from him."[51] However, he points out following Augustine that such necessity "is no compulsion, nor constrained necessity, but a voluntary necessity." He would hold together "the necessity in the will of God predestining" with "the will of the predestined to do good."[52] As for the necessity of man sinning, that lies not so much in God's secret will as in the very nature of man's corruption, from which proceeds only sin, apart from God's grace.

---

[49] Joye, The Refutation of the Byshop of Winchesters Derke Declaration of His False Articles, Once Before Confuted by George Joye. ([London: J. Herford], 1546), fol. xlviib.

[50] Ibid., fol. liiia.

[51] Ibid., fol. xlviiib.

[52] Ibid., fol. xlixa.

Such then is the doctrine of predestination insofar as it was set forth by the Henrician Protestant exile group. One immediately notes, of course, how relatively little these reformers had to say about the doctrine. At best, their views were presented only in outline form, and most frequently they emerged quite incidentally, within the context of a related subject. Some of the more important aspects of the doctrine were ignored altogether. The basic impression is that they were not really interested in dealing with the problem; they seem to have been, in fact, quite anxious to avoid it whenever possible.

To the extent that the exiles did deal with predestination, their teaching was of a moderate character and was basically Augustinian in content. While outwardly perhaps Barnes relied most on Augustine, few of the ideas expounded by the rest of the group went against the Augustinian teaching. When they did differ with Augustine, it was in matters of detail rather than principle.

The Lutheran influence was, of course, a somewhat more immediate factor. In the case of Tyndale a direct and predominate influence of the German reformer is unmistakable, as has already been suggested. In the case of the other reformers, who were in varying degrees also in contact with Lutheranism, the influence was perhaps somewhat less pronounced, but significant nevertheless.[53]

---

[53] For more on the Lutheran influence upon the English exile group generally cf., William A. Clebsch, England's Earliest Protestants, 1520-1535 (Yale Publications in Religion, No. 11; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964). Of all the English exiles Barnes was probably the closest to Luther himself. He was off and on a resident in Wittenberg during the 1530's; and shortly after his death at the stake in England in 1540, Luther made reference to him as "Saint Robert" in a handsome obituary notice. Cf., Erwin Doernberg, Henry VIII and Luther; An Account of Their Personal Relations (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1961), pp. 124-26.

A final question has to do with the role of the doctrine in the total thought of these early reformers. That it was not central has, of course, become obvious. The doctrine was not a main issue in the controversy with the Catholics, the chief adversaries of the group. It was, however, closely related to one of the primary issues in that controversy--that of justification by faith; and it would appear that it was as the premise, support, and safeguard for that vital tenet, and the related broader principle of salvation by grace, that the doctrine was first employed by English reformers. Given these views, which the exiles learned from Luther and Augustine respectively, and the Augustinian-Lutheran doctrine of predestination was almost an inevitable conclusion. Their view of original sin only made the doctrine more useful and necessary.

## The Henrician Formularies

In England itself, while there was a growing party of advanced reformers, no public departure from the official policy with reference to doctrine was permitted. Henry's policy was basically one of orthodoxy in dogma, as has already been indicated. Nevertheless there were some doctrinal developments of significance during the reign. These took place primarily in connection with the appearance of a series of more or less official doctrinal formularies. The first of these, in 1536, was the *Articles Devised by the Kinges Highnes Majestie, To Stablyshe Christen Quietnes and Unitie Amonge Us, and To Avoyde Contentious Opinions*, more generally known as the Ten Articles. The following year these articles were superseded by The Institution of a Christian Man, also called the Bishops' Book. This was largely the work of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer. In 1539 appeared The Six Articles; and in 1543 the Bishops' Book was itself superseded by A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man, commonly known as the King's Book.

The Ten Articles of 1536 represented something of a compromise between orthodox Catholic dogma and the views of the English reforming party. The articles were much indebted to Lutheran ideas and showed the influence of the Anglo-German negotiations into which Henry, due to political considerations, had entered in 1534.[54] However, the view of justification was not clearly Lutheran, and no mention was made of the doctrine of predestination.

The Bishops' Book of 1537 did contain a few incidental references to predestination, most of them coming within the context of ecclesiology. In the first place, a doctrine of original sin is clearly asserted: Because of and ever since Adam's disobedience "the will of man hath been so corrupted with original sin, that we be all utterly inclined to disobey the will and precepts of God."[55] Without grace man can neither love God nor his fellow man. It is God then who has "redeemed us when we were damned,...ordained everlasting life for us, when for our sins we should have been judged to everlasting death."[56]

---

[54] For the political and diplomatic background of these formularies cf., especially, John Duncan Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, 1485-1558, Vol. VI of The Oxford History of England, ed. Sir George Clark (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957); Herbert Maynard Smith, Henry VIII and the Reformation (London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1962); and Ernest Gordon Rupp, Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (Mainly in the Reign of Henry VIII) (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1947).

As for the Church, in its truest sense it is the "company of the elect and faithful people of God." It consists of those "which be chosen, called, and ordained to reign with Christ in everlasting life."[57]

The formulary is clear on the point of the final salvation of the elect: "Neither the leprosy of heresy, or false and perverse doctrine, neither the filthiness of sin, neither the gates of hell, shall be able to prevail against them, or to pull any of them out of the hands and possession of Christ."[58] They may, and often do, err and fall away for a season, but they inevitably shall rise again.

As for the non-elect, these are here on earth mingled with the elect, since "their state is by God's ordinance hidden and kept secret from all men's knowledge." They may even be accounted members of Christ's body for a season; but in the end they "shall finally be judged to everlasting damnation."[59]

---

[55] Charles Lloyd, ed., Formularies of Faith Put Forth by Authority During the Reign of Henry VIII (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1825), p. 186.

[56] Ibid., p. 183.

[57] Ibid., pp. 52, 75.

[58] Ibid., p. 53.

[59] Ibid., p. 54.

The Six Articles of 1539 were extremely cautious in character and were actually designed to check the spread of reformed doctrines and practices. They reflected the breakdown the previous year of the negotiations with the German Lutherans and represented a reversion to the more characteristic Henrician conservatism. Dealing with transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, monastic vows, private masses, and auricular confession, they contained no mention of predestination.

Of all the Henrician formularies the King's Book of 1543 had the most to say on the issues relating to predestination, though again most of it indirectly. For one thing, it contained a separate "Article on Free Will," which was lacking in the earlier Bishop's Book. In clearly Augustinian terms the freedom of the will is defined as

> a certain power of the will joined with reason, whereby a reasonable creature, without constraint in things of reason, discerneth and willeth good and evil; but it willeth not that good which is acceptable to God, except it be holpen with grace; but that which is ill it willeth of itself.[60]

Man's will is free then, yet due to the effects of Adam's fall man is incapable of doing works pleasing unto God apart from God's grace.

In the same article, however, it is clearly asserted that God offers his grace universally to all men: God, "willing all men to be saved, calleth upon all the world, without respect of persons, to come and be partakers of the righteousness, peace, and glory which is in him." It then remains for man in his free will to accept God's grace:

---

[60] Ibid., p. 359.

"They only enjoy it which by their freewill do accept and embrace the same."[61] On the other hand, those who reject the offer do thereby effect their own damnation, as is suggested in the following passage:

> For he [God] is naturally good, and willeth all men to be saved, and careth for them, and provideth all thing by which they may be saved, except by their own malice they will be evil, and so by righteous judgment of God perish and be lost. For truly men be to themselves the authors of sin and damnation. God is neither author of sin, nor the cause of damnation. And yet doth he most righteously damn those men that do with vices corrupt their nature, which he made good, and do abuse the same to evil desires, against his most holy will. Wherefore men be warned that they do not impute to God their vice or their damnation, but to themselves, which by freewill have abused the grace and benefits of God.[62]

Any effective view of the inevitable perseverance of the elect is rejected by the framers of the formulary. The elect certainly may fall from grace through their sin. The following passage gives expression to this idea:

> And here all phantastical imagination, curious reasoning, and vain trust of predestination, is to be laid apart. And according to the plain manner of speaking and teaching of scripture, in inumerable places, we ought evermore to be in dread of our own frailty and natural pronity to fall to sin, and not to assure ourselves that we be elected, any otherwise than by feeling of spiritual motions in our heart, and by the tokens of good and virtuous living, in following the grace of God, and persevering in the same to the end. Wherefore when we be once elected and admitted into God's service (as is aforesaid,) and have received our justification in baptism, or be restored thereunto by true penance, then must we continually walk after Christ, bearing our cross, and increasing in his grace by good works.[63]

---

[61] *Ibid.*, pp. 365, 360.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 362.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 367.

Perseverance is thus conditional upon man's own performance.

Similarly, any effective assurance of election is also denied: "But whether there be any special particular knowledge which man by faith hath certainly of himself, whereby he may testify to himself that he is of the predestinates, which shall to the end persevere in their calling, we have not spoken, nor cannot in scripture nor doctors find that any such faith can be taught or preached."[64]

This much then is said of predestination in the Henrician formularies. Insofar as they do touch upon the doctrine and related problems they set forth a basic Augustinian teaching, with few departures.

## Translations into English: Erasmus Sacerius

One final problem that raises itself with reference to the reign of Henry VIII is that of the extent, if any, of the influence of Lutheranism in England itself, with regard to the doctrine of predestination. The influence on the exiled English reformers has, of course, already been noted. But it is well known that Lutheranism was also a significant factor on the domestic religious scene under Henry VIII.[65]

---

[64] Ibid., p. 224.

[65] Cf., Rupp, Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition; Henry Eyster Jacobs, The Lutheran Movement in England During the Reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, and Its Literary Movements (Rev. ed.; Philadelphia: G. W. Frederick, 1894); and Neelak Serawlook Tjernagel, Henry VIII and the Lutherans: A Study in Anglo-Lutheran Relations from 1521 to 1547 (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1965).

Were predestinarian ideas in any way involved in that influence?

On the surface the answer would seem to be negative. None of the writings of Luther which were significant from a predestinarian point of view were among those translated into English during the period; and the set of religious articles emerging from the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations of 1538, the Thirteen Articles, had nothing to say on the subject.

There was, however, one point of contact worthy of some note. In 1538 a general theological work by the distinguished German Lutheran reformer and theologian, Erasmus Sarcerius, was written and translated into English under the title, Commonplaces: A Compendyous Forme of Teachyng or Discyplyne Declarynge the Common and Pryncypall Places of Our Chrysten Relygion. Designed to support the English Protestants against the Roman Catholics, the work included sections on predestination and free will. Generally, however, Sarcerius took the more moderate later Melanchthonian position with regard to those issues, citing two of Philip Melanchthon's chief works, his Loci Communes and his Commentary on Romans.

Sarcerius defines predestination generally in the following manner:

> Predestination is a sure election by which God hath elected us in himself before the creation of the world, to the end we might be holy and faultless before him by charity, to make us his sons through Jesus Christ in himself according to the pleasure of his will.[66]

---

[66] Erasmus Sacerius, Commonplaces: A Compendyous Forme of Teachyng or Discyplyne Declarynge the Common and Pryncypall Places of Our Chrysten Relygion, trans. Richard Taverner (London: Johan Byddell, 1538), fol. xiiia.

He goes on to speak, however, of predestination after two sorts--a "predestination of alligacion," having to do with the necessity which characterizes God's decrees; and a "predestination of condition."[67] It is with the latter only, he says, that men should concern themselves.

Spelling this out, Sarcerius asserts that the Gospel is universal, offering salvation freely to all men; and it is by this fact that predestination must be interpreted and judged: "If we will wisely speak of predestination, we must fetch our beginning at the gospel, which is an universal promise, and we must evermore have recourse to predestination of condition."[68] Men are predestinate, he says, upon the condition that they receive the Gospel--they are damned when they reject it.

Sarcerius does concede, however, that while of his own free will man may sin, the reception of the Gospel takes place only with the aid of grace. Grace prepares the will, he says, in such a way that it is enabled to accept God's gift.[69] The essential freedom of the will, however, is not thereby compromised.

Sarcerius then represents evidence of a Lutheran-Melanchthonian influence in Henrician England. That the translation appeared in further editions in 1553 and in 1577 is proof that the work did not go altogether unnoticed.

---

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid., fol. xia.

[69] Ibid., fol. xiib.

In summary, it can be said that the Henrician period contributed little of striking significance with regard to the development of the doctrine of predestination in the English Reformation. Very little was written on the subject, and what was produced cannot be classified as extremely important.

The chief contribution of the period would appear to have been the development and establishment of a basically moderate tradition with regard to the doctrine of predestination in English thought. The Augustinian-Lutheran doctrine of Tyndale and his associates was reinforced by the Augustinianism of the official formularies and the Melanchthonianism of the only relevant translation of any significance. As will be seen later, however, this moderate Henrician tradition was to be the very foundation upon which the subsequent development of the doctrine in the English Reformation was to be based.

# CHAPTER II

# THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION AMONG THE EDWARDIAN REFORMERS

The second major phase of the English Reformation began in 1547 with the death of Henry VIII and the accession of King Edward VI, then nine years old. Party as a result of the lifting of the restraining influence which Henry had exercised, and partly due to a heightening of the continental influence (an influence of a somewhat changing character), the party of advanced reformers, who now gained control, carried the English Reformation to its most Protestant position, doctrinally, liturgically, as well as in other regards.

## The Major Edwardian Reformers

It is somewhat arbitrary to treat such figures as Thomas Cranmer, John Hooper, and Hugh Latimer as Edwardians; for they were also Henricians. And yet it was during the six-year reign of Edward VI that their most significant contributions, particularly for the purposes of this study, occurred. These reformers, along with such others as Nicholas Ridley and John Bradford,[1] were the most prominent divines of the Edwardian reign, and it is therefore to their writings that one must first turn in examining the theology of the period.

---

[1] Nicholas Ridley and John Bradford will be treated later in connection with the Protestant predestinarian controversy under Queen Mary I.

As for Thomas Cranmer, in the first place he was more of an ecclesiastical reformer than a theologian; and in the second place, when he did concern himself with theology he was most interested in areas such as justification and the sacraments. Apart from his role in the composition of the Edwardian formularies, which will be discussed in a later context, he had very little indeed to say about predestination. The only place where he approached the subject was in the annotations which he made upon Henry VIII's corrections of The Institution of a Christian Man. Even there he says nothing of any real significance: only that election comes solely from God's goodness and not from human merit, that the elect are not able to withstand God's calling, and that although they may temporarily fall they shall rise again and perpetually endure.[2]

Perhaps the most progressive of the major Edwardian reformers was John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester (and later Worcester). Certainly he was in the closest contact with continental theology. Hooper had early been impressed with the ideas of the Zurich reformers Ulrich Zwingli and Heinrich Bullinger. Finding it necessary during the latter years of Henry VIII to flee England in order to escape prosecution for heresy, he spent the last two years of his exile at Zurich studying personally with Bullinger. During his residence there his theological opinions became established in the Tigurine tradition. Upon his return to England in 1549 he immediately became the leader of the most advanced party of the English reformers.

---

[2] Thomas Cranmer, The Works of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, ed. John Edmund Cox (The Parker Society Publications; 2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1844, 1846), II, 91, 92, 95.

While dependent most upon Bullinger for his overall theology, Hooper interestingly enough owed as much to Philip Melanchthon for his views on predestination. He dealt with the subject in his prefatory remarks to A Declaration of the Ten Commaundements of Almyghthye God of 1548. The work was probably written and published in Zurich, and bears some resemblence in its general framework to the covenant theology of Bullinger.[3] But on predestination as such Hooper drew rather heavily and directly upon the somewhat more moderate Melanchthon as well, some of his key passages having been translated verbally from the chapter on predestination in the 1535 and later editions of Melanchthon's Loci Communes.

The premise with which Hooper begins is that the promises of the Gospel are general and are applicable to all men: "The promise of grace appertaineth unto every sort of men in the world, and comprehendeth them all."[4] Just as Adam's fall had involved the entire human race in sin, so Christ's death offers salvation to all men. God's will is essentially that all men should be saved.

Consequently, to affirm that God "with necessity of destiny violently pulleth one by the hair to heaven, and thrustest the other headlong into hell" is to misunderstand the Gospel.[5] Rather, those be elect who simply "by faith apprehend the mercy promised in Christ."[6] While the cause of election is "the mercy of God in Christ," and while "God draweth with his word and the Holy Ghost," yet man is no "dead post," but must "receive the grace offered, consent unto the promise, and not repugn the God that calleth."[7]

---

[3] William Morris S. West, "John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism," The Baptist Quarterly, XV, No. 8 (October, 1954), 356-57.

[4] John Hooper, Early Writings of John Hooper, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, Martyr, 1555, ed. Samuel Carr (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1843), p. 259.

Similarly, "the cause of rejection or damnation is sin in man, which will not hear, neither receive the promise, of the gospel."[8] Original sin is not enough for condemnation, unless to this be added man's own transgression. "Then," he says, "we exclude by this means ourselves from the promises and merits of Christ."[9] Cain, for example, "was no more excluded, till he excluded himself, than Abel."[10] The same can be said of Saul, Judas, and Esau.

At the conclusion of his treatise Hooper added several short additional selections in which among other topics he dealt with the dangers of presumption, curiosity, and desperation. Of presumption he warns against the "horrible sin" of "presuming of God's mercy."[11] Of curiosity he cautions against "overmuch searching the privities and secrets of God," which can only lead to no good end.[12] Of desperation he counsels: "Learn this doctrine, that God will always forgive, how many and how horrible soever the sins be."[13]

---

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 263.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 264, 265. *Cf.*, Philip Melanchthon, *Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia* [Hereinafter referred to as *Opera*], ed. Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (Corpus Reformatorum, I-XXVIII; 28 vols.; Halis Saxonum, Brunsvigae: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1834-1860), XXI, 915-16.

[8] *Early Writings of John Hooper*, p. 264. *Cf.*, Melanchthon, *Opera*, XXI, 915.

[9] *Early Writings of John Hooper*, p. 263.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 259.

This then is Hooper's doctrine, cautious and reserved. He is clearly in line with the moderate continental tradition of Melanchthon and (to a lesser degree) his own master Bullinger. Above all else he is interested in emphasizing the responsibility of man and the mercy of God in predestination.

If a moderate view was represented in Hooper, a somewhat more extreme position was taken by the man with whom Hooper engaged in a controversy on the subject, Bartholomew Traheron. Traheron also had been an early admirer of Bullinger and likewise had gone abroad during the reign of Henry VIII. He was in Zurich in 1537 and probably visited Geneva the following year. He soon returned to England, but in 1546 he again was in Geneva. As a result of his visits to Geneva Traheron came increasingly under the influence of the theology of John Calvin; and eventually he adopted that reformer's views on predestination.

Having returned to England again in 1548, the following year Traheron became involved in a somewhat bitter and violent controversy with Hooper over the doctrine of predestination. Only a few references to the quarrel have survived, but it is known that it lasted on through the year 1550.[14] Upon the accession of Queen Mary I Traheron fled, first to Frankfort, but eventually settled at Wesel. There he served as lecturer in divinity until his death, probably in 1558.

---

[11] _Ibid._, p. 415.

[12] _Ibid._, p. 419.

[13] _Ibid._, p. 423.

As for Traheron's views on the doctrine of predestination, there are two sources which are of some relevance. The first of these, which throws some interesting light as well on the position of the doctrine during Edward's reign generally, is a letter, dated September 10, 1552, from Traheron to Bullinger. The crucial passage is as follows:

> I am exceedingly desirous to know what you and the other very learned men, who live at Zurich, think respecting the predestination and providence of God. If you ask the reason, there are certain individuals here who lived among you some time, and who assert that you lean too much to Melanchthon's views. But the greater number among us, of whom I own myself to be one, embrace the opinion of John Calvin as being perspicuous, and most agreeable to holy scripture. And we truly thank God, that that excellent treatise of the very learned and excellent John Calvin against Pighius and one Georgius Siculus should have come forth at the very time when the question began to be agitated among us. For we confess that he has thrown much light upon the subject, or rather so handled it, as that we have never before seen any thing more learned or more plain. We are anxious however, to know what are your opinions, to which we justly allow much weight. We certainly hope that you differ in no respect from his excellent and most learned opinion. At least you will please to point out what you approve in that treatise, or think defective, or

---

[14] Hastings Robinson, ed., Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, Written During the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary (The Parker Society Publications; 2 pts.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1846, 1847), pp. 406, 426.

> reject altogether, if indeed you do reject any part of it, which we shall not easily believe.[15]

The first thing to be noted about the passage is that it gives clear indication that the doctrine was being debated during the last months of Edward VI. It is unlikely that the debate referred to was the controversy between Traheron and Hooper, as that had ended by the close of 1550. More than likely the reference is to the discussions then in progress in connection with the framing of the Edwardian Articles. If this be the case then the passage sheds some interesting light upon the seventeenth article of that formulary. More about this will be said later, however.

Secondly, the passage reveals something of the influence which Bullinger had come to exert over many of the Edwardian reformers in this regard. His strongest supporter, of course, must have been his disciple Hooper; but even Traheron was willing to admit that Bullinger's views carried much weight in England, and he was anxious to add their support to his own party's cause.

Finally, Traheron's references to Calvin generally, and in particular to himself as a Calvinist with regard to predestination, are of considerable significance. These references represent the earliest direct indication of the influence of Calvin's rigid views on the issue in England. Of course the suggestion that those holding Calvin's views were in the majority at this point must have been an exaggeration, as it is not elsewhere supported or confirmed. But that the Genevan reformer was by now beginning to gain a following in England is clear. Especially significant is the indication that Calvin's Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God of 1552, the strongest statement of his predestinarian views, was being read in England, although it did not see an English translation during the sixteenth century.

---

[15] Ibid., pp. 325-26.

Bullinger's answer to Traheron's Letter consisted of a somewhat lengthy treatise on providence and predestination in which he disclaimed many of Calvin's views and set forth his own comparatively moderate opinions.[16] That Traheron was not altogether convinced is evident from a later letter of his to Bullinger, dated June 3, 1553. There he writes as follows:

> I acknowledge, my excellent Bullinger, your especial kindness, who for the sake of satisfying my earnest request have thought it no trouble to write to me so fully and accurately respecting the providence and predestination of God. But though I admire both your exceeding learning and moderation in this writing of yours, nevertheless, to say the truth I cannot altogether think as you do.[17]

Traheron then goes on to defend Calvin's position, especially with regard to providence.

The second source relevant to Traheron's views is a short treatise of his entitled "An Exposition of These Wordes (Leade Us Not into Temtation)." While it did not see publication until 1557, as an appendage to a larger work, Traheron noted that it had been written "long before these former lectures."[18] In this treatise he touched briefly upon election and reprobation within the context of a discussion of temptation.

---

[16] For Bullinger's answer, cf., John Calvin, Joannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia, ed. Guilielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, and Eduardus Reuss (Corpus Reformatorum, XXIX-LXXXVII; 59 vols.; Brunsvigae et Berolinae: C. A. Schwetscke et Filium, 1863-1900), XIV, 480-90.

[17] Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, p. 326.

God occasionally tempts the elect, Traheron says, in order to humble them, by showing them the weakness of their naturally corrupt nature. They are never, however, brought into a temptation which they cannot overcome, "for whom he hath once chosen, them he hath chosen for ever." In the final analysis, "the godly are out of danger and fear," for "no man can take them out of his hand."[19]

"But he bringeth some into a perpetual temptation," Traheron adds, "utterly giving them up to Satan, and hardening them in wickedness for ever."[20] The complete reason for this cannot be known, but it is enough that they "are worthy to be hardened." Their "former hardness deserved to be made harder," he writes.[21] In any event, God's part cannot but be just. Objections to such views are but the "dotings of brainsick men."[22]

Such views obviously do not contradict those of Calvin; yet neither do they give as full expression to some of the more distinctive Calvinist ideas as one would expect from such an avowed Calvinist. While some allowance must be made for the fact that Traheron was not writing directly and specifically about predestination, even so, on the basis of the available evidence one cannot but suspect that he was somewhat less of a Calvinist in this regard than he himself thought.

---

[18] Bartholomew Traheron, _An Exposition of the 4 Chap. of S. Joans Revelation, Made by Bar_[tholomew] _Traheron in Sondrie Readings Before His Countre Men in Germanie, Wherein the Providence of God Is Treated, with an Answer Made to the Objections of a Gentle Adversarie_ ([Zurich?: C. Froschauer?], 1557), [p. 54].

[19] _Ibid._, [pp. 54-56].

[20] _Ibid._, [p. 55].

[21] _Ibid._, [p. 58].

[22] _Ibid._, [p. 65].

A final note on Traheron has to do with one other work of his which apparently has not survived. The English church historian John Strype makes reference to a controversy on the subject of predestination which developed in the succeeding reign between Traheron and "a certain learned person," while Traheron was lecturing at Wesel.[23] Strype suggests that Traheron afterwards composed something of an apology for his views; and another eminent English historian, Samuel Roffey Maitland, has identified this as a work entitled An Answer Made by Bar[tholomew] Traheron to a Privie Papiste Which Crepte in to the English Congregation of Christian Exiles Undre the Visor of a Favorer of the Gospel.[24] Although the work is no longer extant, sections reprinted by Maitland suggest that the controversy may have turned on the interpretation of certain passages from Augustine. The sections are so short, however, that little beyond this can be learned about the character of the work.

---

[23] John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Relating Chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of It and the Emergencies of the Church of England, Under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary I (3 vols. in 6 pts.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822), III, i, 543.

[24] Samuel Roffey Maitland, Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England (London: John Lane, 1899), p. 60.

If Hooper and Traheron represent in a sense the influence of the continental traditions on Edwardian theology, Hugh Latimer may be taken to represent the English divine who was not to any great extent influenced by the foreign schools. He had not been abroad, as had both Hooper and Traheron, but had learned his theology at home. He may therefore be taken to represent a substantial group of Edwardian divines whose theology had been arrived at quite independently of continental Protestant influences.

With regard to the doctrine of predestination Latimer was undoubtedly closer to Hooper, Melanchthon, and Bullinger, than he was to Traheron and Calvin. In a series of sermons composed in 1552 he dealt briefly with the subject. In a sermon preached on January 17, Latimer warned against becoming involved in "curious and dangerous questions" upon hearing that "some be chosen and some be damned."[25] In particular he warns against making the doctrine of predestination an excuse for sinful living on the basis that it has already been decided who is to be saved and who to be damned. It is man's wickedness, in fact, which is the cause of damnation: "For if the most part be damned, the fault is not in God, but in themselves," for "they themselves procure their own damnation and despise the passion of Christ by their own wicked and inordinate living."[26]

---

[25] Hugh Latimer, _Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555_, ed. George Elwes Corrie (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1845), p. 175.

[26] _Ibid_.

Rather than trouble oneself with curious questions about predestination, Latimer exhorts the believer to make sure that he believes in Christ; for "if thou believest in him, then thou art written in the book of life, and shalt be saved."[27] As he writes in another connection, "Christ shed as much blood for Judas, as he did for Peter: Peter believed it, and therefore he was saved; Judas would not believe it, therefore he was condemned, the fault being in him only, in nobody else."[28]

As for how one may know and be sure that he is among the elect, Latimer advises in the first place that "we may one time be in the book, and another time come out again." There are, however, three "special notes" whereby one's election may be tested. They are: a sense of sin, a true and lively faith in Christ, and an earnest desire of amendment. "When you find these three things in your hearts," he writes, "then you may be sure that your names are written in the book: and you may be sure also, that you are elect and predestinate to everlasting life."[29]

Latimer had the most to say about predestination in a sermon preached February 14, 1552. There he set forth what amounts to a double qualification of the doctrine, or a two-fold refuge to which from the doctrine the believer may flee. In the first place, predestination must always be viewed in the light of God's love as expressed in Jesus Christ. In this regard he writes as follows:

---

[27] Ibid.

[28] Sermons by Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555, ed. Corrie (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1844), p. 521.

[29] Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, pp. 175-76.

> But when we be about this matter, and are troubled within ourselves, whether we be elect or no, we must ever have this maxim or principal rule before our eyes; namely that God beareth a good will towards us. God loveth us; God beareth a fatherly heart towards us....We may know God's will towards us through Christ: God hath opened himself unto us by his Son Christ....Therefore we may perceive his good-will and love towards us: he hath sent the same his Son into this world, which hath suffered most painful death for us. Shall I now think that God hateth me? Or shall I doubt of his love towards me? Here you see how you shall avoid the scrupulous and most dangerous question of the predestination of God.[30]

As far as man is concerned then the will of God toward him is most perfectly expressed in Christ. Furthermore, it is to Christ that one must always turn to know of his election:

> But if thou art desirous to know whether thou art chosen to everlasting life, thou mayest not begin with God: for God is too high, thou canst not comprehend him. The judgments of God are unknown to man; therefore thou mayst not begin there: but begin with Christ, and learn to know Christ, and wherefore he came....Consider, I say, Christ and his coming; and then begin to try thyself, whether thou art in the book of life or not. If thou findest thyself in Christ, then thou art sure of everlasting life. If thou be without him, then thou art in an evil case.[31]

Christ is "the accounting book and register of God," he adds. Belief in him carries with it the assurance of election.[32]

The second qualification which Latimer imposes upon the doctrine is that it must be viewed in the light of the universality of the Gospel. "The gospel is universal," he writes, and God "would have all mankind saved."[33] God's "salvation is sufficient to save all mankind," there being "none so wicked, but he may have a remedy." The cause of damnation then is that "we are so wicked of ourselves that we refuse the same, and we will not take it, when it is offered unto us."[34] The phrase, "few are chosen," means only that "few have pleasure and delight in it [the Gospel]."[35]

---

[30] _Ibid_., p. 205.

[31] _Ibid_., pp. 204-205.

[32] _Ibid_., p. 206.

Thus Latimer can summarize his position as follows: "And so, whosoever heareth the word of God, and followeth it, the same is elect by him: and again, whosoever refuseth to hear the word of God, and follow the same, is damned."[36]

A final figure of some importance under Edward VI was Thomas Becon, whose works actually span the period from the last years of the reign of Henry VIII to the first years of Queen Elizabeth I. Basically Becon would prefer not to meddle in the mysteries of God's predestination, as he pointed out in the preface to his _Principles of Christian Religion Necessary To Be Known of the Faithful_:

> Let other entreat of high mysteries, and climb up to the highest heaven: I shall be content to write of things according to my knowledge and your capacity, and to creep upon the ground. Let other talk of the unknown secrets of the blessed Trinity, of predestination, of the state of the souls departed, Etc.: I will speak of the articles of the christian faith, of

---

[33] _Ibid_., p. 205.

[34] _Ibid_., pp. 206, 207.

[35] _Ibid_., p. 206.

[36] _Ibid_.

> the Lord's prayer, of the ten commandments, of the sacraments of Christ's church, Etc.[37]

However, Becon did touch upon the subject and some related problems in several of his other works.

Of the effects of Adam's fall, Becon writes as follows in his News Out of Heaven Both Pleasant and Joyful:

> O miserable and pitiful change! O change more perilous than it can be expressed! Now is a man become of immortal mortal, of good evil, of righteous wicked, of wise foolish, of holy profane, of virtuous ill-disposed, of free bond, of merciful cruel, of godly devilish, of faithful unfaithful, of spiritual carnal, of true false, of a vessel of mercy the vessel of wrath, of the son of God the son of the devil, of the heir of glory the heir of damnation.[38]

All of Adam's posterity have inherited from him this changed state, so that man of his own free will "can do nothing in matters of faith and everlasting salvation."[39]

Predestination then is "the secret election of the wisdom of God to eternal life, without our deserving": it is "the secret unchangeable appointment of God, before all beginnings, by his counsel and wisdom, to life everlasting concerning his elect and chosen people."[40] The elect do not choose God by their works, but God chooses them by his grace. And yet, in some sense "they be predestinate and called to everlasting life, which hear and receive the word of God."[41]

---

[37] Thomas Becon, The Catechism of Thomas Becon, S.T.P., Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, Prebendary of Canterbury, Etc., with Other Pieces Written by Him in the Reign of King Edward the Sixth [Hereinafter referred to as The Catechism], ed. John Ayre (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1844), p. 481.

[38] The Early Works of Thomas Becon, S.T.P., Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, Prebendary of Canterbury, Etc., ed. Ayre (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1843), p. 46.

[39] The Common-Places of the Holy Scripture, in Prayers and Other Pieces of Thomas Becon, S.T.P., Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, Prebendary of Canterbury, Etc. [Hereinafter referred to as Prayers and Other Pieces], ed. Ayre (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1844), p. 328.

"To be elected is to be saved," Becon declares in his catechetical work. "God's elect can by no means perish," there being a certain number of God's sheep who hear his voice, and whom no one is able to pluck from his hand.[42] But what of the problem of assurance, Becon's theme in The Sick Man's Salve? "What if I be not of the number of those whom God hath predestinated to be saved?" asks Epaphroditus. Friends reassure him that his repentance, faith, baptism, frequent partaking of the Lord's Supper, and fervent prayer are "evident testimony of your salvation, and that God hath predestinate and tofore appointed you unto everlasting life."[43]

Finally, Becon warns that God is not to be thought of as the author of man's evil and his damnation: "That we are tempted unto evil, we ourselves, whose nature is always prone unto evil, and the devil, which naturally is bent to seek our destruction, is the cause thereof, and not God." Hence, "if we perish and be damned, we ourselves and the devil are the alone authors of our destruction."[44]

---

[40] The Demands of Holy Scripture, with Answers to the Same, in Prayers and Other Pieces, pp. 608, 616.

[41] Ibid., p. 608.

[42] A New Catechism, Set Forth Dialogue-Wise, in The Catechism, p. 222.

[43] Prayers and Other Pieces, pp. 172-74.

One can thus characterize the predestinarian views of the major Edwardian reformers in much the same manner as those of the earlier Henrician exiles. If anything, the Edwardians were even more evasive and had even less to say on the subject. They offered no major or sustained treatment of the doctrine, and they added little to what had already been said by the earlier group. Actually one must conclude that the Henricians were willing to discuss more aspects of the doctrine.

One tendency in the writings of these reformers that is of some significance, however, is the shift even further in the direction of moderation. The opinions of Hooper and Latimer typify this basically cautious and restrained approach.[45] The Augustinian influence was perhaps less direct among this group, and the continental influence had by now largely shifted away from the purely Lutheran tradition. Traheron excepted, the primary tendencies of the group seem to have paralleled rather closely those of the more moderate continental tradition exemplified by Melanchthon and Bullinger.

---

[44] A New Catechism, Set Forth Dialogue-Wise, in The Catechism, p. 194.

[45] It is interesting to note that in 1631, in the midst of the so-called "Arminian" Controversy, the editor of a controversial anti-Calvinist pamphlet chose excerpts from the writings of Hooper and Latimer to prove that the doctrine received from "the First Fathers of the Reformation in England," was not Calvinistic, but rather tended in the opposite direction. Cf., J. A. [T. Parriett], ed., An Historical Narration of the Judgement of Some Most Learned and Godly English Bishops, Holy Martyrs, and Others, Concerning God's Election, and the Merit of Christ His Death (London: B. A. and T. F. for Samuel Nealand, 1631).

## Developments in Kent

While the major reformers were thus rather restrained with regard to the doctrine, there were nevertheless some significant developments among other groups during the Edwardian period. In the year 1550 there was printed in Canterbury what would appear to have been the earliest treatise of the English Reformation dealing entirely and exclusively with the doctrine of predestination. The treatise was written by one John Lamberd, minister of Elham, Kent, and was entitled Of Predestinacion & Election. Consisting of only fifteen small, unnumbered pages, the treatise may well have been the shortest of the period as well.

The pretext upon which Lamberd entered into the subject of predestination was his desire to give an answer to those who would "dispute with God why he hath ordained the vessels of wrath to damnation."[46] The pretext was somewhat deceiving, however, as the only real answer he gave was the Pauline answer, "that he [God] might declare the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy which he hath prepared unto glory." "The reprobates," he concludes, "are ministers unto the salvation of the elect."[47] They were ordained "to show the glory of God and his mighty power to all the world."[48] Rather than being questioned for damning the reprobate, who have justly earned damnation, God should be praised for mercifully saving the elect.

---

[46] John Lamberd, Of Predestinacion & Election (Canterbury: J. Mychell, 1550), [p. i].

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid., [p. 10].

Lamberd did, however, move from that pretext into a comparative discussion of the two categories of men, the elect and the reprobate. Both, he asserts, were predestined to their respective fates "before the world was laid," God knowing from the beginning who would "go the broad way that leadeth to perdition," and who would "go the straight way that leadeth to eternal life."[49] There the similarity ends, however, for in actual life the two classes are clearly distinguishable.

The chief distinction between the elect and the reprobate for Lamberd has to do with their differing responses to the preached Word. For the elect God's Word is "an odor of life"; for the reprobate it is "an odor of death."[50] The elect respond in faith; the reprobate are denied faith, "for God's word hindereth and hurteth them." They are "destitute of God's grace": "For the passion of Christ can not save a reprobate."[51] Indeed, the very test of election is that every man should examine his own life for this "lively faith," which is "a very sure token that he is the very elect of God."[52] Similarly, the two groups are further distinguished by their fruit, which are the outward token of one's state.[53]

---

[49] Ibid., [pp. 1-2].

[50] Ibid., [p. 4].

[51] Ibid., [pp. 3-4].

[52] Ibid., [p. 14].

Lamberd provided no clue as to the historical setting of his short "judgement" on predestination. What may well have been the most significant facts about the treatise were the date of its publication and the geographical area from which it was issued. Whether by mere coincidence of history or not, from the same year and from the same geographical area has come the earliest evidence of the existence of a group known to their contemporaries as the "Freewillers." Among the earliest separatists from the reformed Church of England, the group was especially noted for its antipathy toward the doctrine of predestination.

It would appear that as early as 1549 these Freewillers had become involved in the establishment of separatist conventicles at Faversham, in Kent, and at Bocking, in Essex. Among the chief leaders whose names have survived were Henry Hart, Humphrey Middleton, Cuthbert Sympson, George Brodelbridge, one Cole of Faversham, and one Cole of Maidstone.[54] Within a year, however, the existence of the group had come to the attention of the authorities and several arrests had been made. Some of the Freewillers were even brought before the King's Privy Council, and royal commissions, composed of prominent prelates, divines, and laymen, were set up to deal with those charged with heresy.[55]

---

[53] Ibid., [pp. 10-13].

[54] Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, II, i, 369; and Champlin Burrage, The Early English Dissenters, in the Light of Recent Research (1550-1641) (2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1912), I, 51.

What happened to the Freewill congregations after this is not known for certain. That the leaders continued their activity, however, is evident from the fact that most of their names were to appear again in the annals of the predestinarian disputes which were to arise among the Protestants imprisoned for their religion under Mary.

An insight into the character of the group's opinions with regard to predestination is provided by a document containing certain depositions dating from c.1550, which may have been made in the provincial ecclesiastical court of Canterbury.[56] Certain ones of the implicated persons would appear to have deposed against the rest. The following selections are typical of the opinions they are alleged to have held:

> That the doctrine of predestination was meeter for devils than for Christian men. [Cole of Faversham.]
>
> That there was no man so chosen but that he might damn himself; neither yet any man so reprobate but that he might keep God's commandments. [Henry Hart.]
>
> That Saint Paul might have damned himself if he listed. [Henry Hart.]
>
> That God's predestination is not certain but upon condition. [George Brodelbridge.]

---

[55] Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England, from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction (2nd ed., rev.; 6 vols.; London: George Routledge and Sons, 1884-1903), III, 39 ff.

[56] Harleian MS 421.64, in the British Museum. Burrage has printed these documents in The Early English Dissenters, II, 1-4.

> That children were not born in original Sin. [Cole of Maidstone.]
>
> That Adam was elected to be saved, and that all men being then in Adam's loins were predestinate to be saved, and that there were no reprobates. [Humphrey Middleton.]
>
> That the preaching of predestination is a damnable doctrine. [General affirmation.] [57]

Evidence concerning the activity and enthusiasm of the group is provided by another document--a letter, preserved by Strype, dating from the following reign. Written by an anonymous person who had been a Freewiller in the time of Edward VI but who had been converted to predestinarian views by his fellow-prisoners under Mary, the letter was addressed to the ex-Freewiller's former associates and was intended as both an apology for his conversion as well as a gentle recommendation that his example be followed by his readers. "I sigh and am grieved," he writes, "because I spake evil of that good I knew not. Yet I have obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly."[58] Again, "I, for my part, repent that ever I was so bitter unto them that were the teachers of this undoubted truth. Verily, I am not able to express the sorrows that I have in my heart, most especially in that I went about by all means to persuade other, whereby they might be one with me in that error of freewill."[59] Indeed, one of the causes of the "misery and calamity" which had befallen the realm under Mary was "because we were not sound in the predestination of God; but we were rather enemies unto it.[60]

---

[57] Harleian MS 421.64, fols. 133-34.

[58] Included in Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, III, ii, 327.

[59] Ibid., p. 326.

What one has here then is a direct and outright repudiation of the doctrine of predestination on the part of these Freewillers. While earlier English reformers had upon occasion moderated and certainly questioned the harshness of the doctrine, there had never before in the course of the English Reformation been such a categorical rejection of the theme. Even the Roman Catholic controversialists, who had quite persistently criticized and attacked the views of the reformers, had always been principally concerned only to refute certain interpretations of the doctrine, and never to deny the validity of the concept as a whole.

And the challenge can hardly be viewed otherwise than as one coming from within the reformed ranks; for, although there were some similarities of views, the Freewillers were not themselves Anabaptists, as has often been assumed.[61] The events of the following reign were to make it quite clear that basically the group shared a common tradition with the reformers--a fact which even some of the more prominent of the reformers were to be willing upon occasion to admit.

Nor, finally, was the influence of the new group to be confined only to the Edwardian period. As shall be seen, the Freewillers were to play a continuing and increasingly important role in the discussions of the doctrine during the succeeding reigns. In fact, under Mary their role was clearly to be well out of proportion to any numerical strength they might have claimed.

---

[60] Ibid., p. 325.

[61] Marshall M. Knappen refers to the group as "halfway Anabaptists." Knappen, Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 149.

## Translations into English and the Continental Theologians in England

Notice of the rise of the Freewillers in this period was taken by yet another writer as well. In the same year (1550) there appeared at London a translation consisting of the two basic works of Augustine on the subject of predestination--his Treatise on the Predestination of the Saints and the companion Treatise on the Gift of Perseverance, both of 428 or 429. In the preface the translator, one Nicholas Lesse, made it clear that the work was directed primarily against the rise of the Freewillers, "a corrupt sort of heretics,...many of them utterly denying that there is any predestination at all."[62] These "stout defenders of freewill" are especially dangerous, he feels, in that their heretical opinions are most frequently combined with outward holiness of life, they being "covered and cloaked over with godly words, such as a man would think did come from the mouth of god himself, with outward religion, and sanctimony of life."[63] The danger is compounded, he feels, by the persuasiveness with which the group is "able to deceive yea those which are wise men, much more the simple and unlearned people."[64] Indeed, the "venomous beasts" are able to "infect almost all men, whom they do but look on."[65] For these reasons the translator feels called upon to warn men of the dangers of the Freewillers, and to show them, as well as those whom they would deceive, "that this doctrine of predestination...is no strange and new doctrine, but such as the old church hath alway firmly believed and constantly defended."[66]

---

[62] Nicholas Lesse,"The Epistle," A Worke of the Predestination of Saints, Wrytten by the Famous Doctor S. Augustine Byshop of Carthage, by Aurelius Augustine, trans. Lesse (London: The Wydowe of John Herforde for Gwalter Lynne, 1550), [pp. i-ii].

[63] Ibid., [p. ii].

The events of 1550 then indicate that, the cautious moderation of some of the more prominent divines notwithstanding, discussion of the doctrine of predestination was clearly in the air by the midway point of the Edwardian reign. Nor was the translation of Augustine an isolated event; for the short reign of Edward VI was the period when the influence of foreign theological opinions was probably the greatest in the history of the English Church.

The major foreign influence was, as one might expect, that of continental Protestantism. There has, of course, already been occasion to see some aspects of this influence among the major Edwardian theologians, and the discussion of the Edwardian formularies in a later context will provide still further occasion. But the most direct manifestation of the influence had to do with the actual presence in England of a substantial group of distinguished continental reformers during the greater part of the reign of Edward VI. With regard to the development of the doctrine of predestination, the influence of this group was undoubtedly toward a stronger and somewhat more predestinarian expression.

---

[64] *Ibid*.

[65] *Ibid*., [p. iv].

[66] *Ibid*., [pp. ii-iii]. A new translation of the same two works of Augustine appeared during the reign of Queen Mary I, probably in 1556. Translated by John Scory, it was directed primarily at the Catholics and was intended as an apology for the doctrines put forward under Kings Henry VIII and Edward VI. It apparently had nothing to do with the disputes about predestination among the imprisoned Protestants. *Cf*., Augustine, *Two Bokes of the Noble Doctor and B. S. Augustine, Thone Entitled of the Predestinacion of Saintes, Thother of Perseverance unto Thende, Whereunto Are Annexed the Determinations of Two Auncient Generall Councelles, Confermyng the Doctrine Taught in These Bokes by S. Aug*[ustine], trans. John Scory ([London?, 1556]).

As is well known, the English Church saw the influx of a significantly large group of continental divines during the early years of Edward VI. Among the first of the succession to receive the hospitality offered by Archbishop Cranmer were the Italian reformers Bernardino Ochino and Peter Martyr Vermigli, both of whom arrived in England toward the end of 1547. They were followed in 1548 by the Spaniard Francisco Dryander, the Italian Jew John Immanuel Tremellius, and the Frenchman Peter Alexander. The Germans Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius arrived during the summer of 1549. Other prominent reformers who came were Valeran Poullain the Frenchman and John à Lasco the Pole.

Indicative of the influence which this group came to wield in the Edwardian Church are some of the positions which they assumed upon coming to England. Vermigli and Bucer were appointed to the influential Regius Professorships of Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge Universities respectively; Dryander, Fagius, and Tremellius were each appointed to lectureships at Cambridge; and à Lasco was given the superintendency of the congregations of foreign Protestants in London. In their various situations these continental reformers made an impression of a momentous character upon the English Church.[67]

Nor did the influence fail to extend to the doctrine of predestination. The majority of these reformers represented the Reformed wing of continental Protestantism, and as such the weight of their general influence, as has already been suggested, was doubtless in the direction of a predestinarian theology. Such must have been the case with Bucer, for instance, whose overall influence in England was second to none among the group. As early as 1536 the Strasburg reformer had expounded a moderately Reformed doctrine of predestination in his Commentary on Romans, which he dedicated significantly enough to Archbishop Cranmer. And although in England his attention for the most part was directed toward other areas of interest, it is reasonable to assume that his views in this regard were not altogether without impact.

But more specifically, at least two of the continental group made distinct and direct contributions to the development of the doctrine in England: Ochino through the translation of a series of his sermons on the subject; and Vermigli through his Oxford lectures on Romans.[68]

---

[67] For a full discussion of the work of the continental reformers in England under Edward VI, cf., Charles H. Smyth, Cranmer and the Reformation Under Edward VI (The Thirlwall and Gladstone Prize Essay, 1925; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1926).

[68] A third member of the group, Peter Alexander of Arles, the late chaplain to Mary of Burgandy, also made a direct contribution, through a series of lectures on predestination which he gave at Canterbury in 1552; but his teaching lacked the authority and influence of the other two more prominent figures. The manuscript of these lectures was preserved by Archbishop Matthew Parker and is now Corpus Christi College Library MS 115.

Bernardino Ochino was a native of Siena and early in his career he had risen to the position of vicar-general of the new Capuchin order. He had been an extremely popular and eloquent preacher in Italy, before being forced to flee the Inquisition in 1542 on charges of heresy. Making his way to Geneva, he remained in Calvin's city for three years as minister to the congregation of Italian refugees, and was apparently influenced to some extent by Calvin's theology. In 1545 he moved to Augsburg where he again ministered to the Italians resident there.

In 1547, at Cranmer's invitation, Ochino migrated to England along with Vermigli. The following year he was made a non-residentiary prebendary of Canterbury and was awarded an annual pension from the Crown. While in England he spent most of his time in literary activities and in labors once again among his countrymen, in London. He remained in England until the death of Edward VI in 1553, after which he returned to the continent.[69]

As early as 1543-1544 Ochino had shown a keen interest in the doctrine of predestination. In those years he published at Geneva a series of fourteen sermons in Italian dealing with the subject. These sermons contained the heart of his teaching with regard to the doctrine.

---

[69] Smyth, Cranmer and the Reformation Under Edward VI, pp. 114-17; Roland H. Bainton, The Travail of Religious Liberty: Nine Biographical Studies (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), pp. 145-72; and James McMullen Rigg, "Bernardino Ochino," Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Sidney Lee (London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1895), XLI, 350-53.

Toward the middle of Edward's reign, probably in 1550, an English translation of Ochino's sermons on predestination appeared at London under the title, *Fouretene Sermons of Barnardine Ochyne, Concernyng the Predestinacion and Eleccion of God*. Translated by Anne Cooke, afterward the wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, the sermons, together with eleven others not dealing with predestination, saw a second edition the same year, and still another, probably in 1570. The prefaces, unfortunately, provide no clue as to the specific reasons or motives for the translation.

Ochino's sermons were predominately practical in character. Witness the title of the first sermon of the series: "Whether Predestination Ought To Be Written, Spoken, or Thought." Within such a framework, however, a rather clear expression of his doctrinal views was given.

At the very outset of his first sermon Ochino warns against an overly curious attempt to search out the mysteries of God in predestination. "It is our office," he writes, "to be content, with as much as God hath vouchsafed to open unto us in the sacred Scriptures, in the which, he hath given us light sufficiently."[70] On the other hand, it is just as evil to be ignorant of that which God has in fact revealed. "Predestination is a great part of the Gospel," he writes: "Wilt thou that we hold our peace of that thing which Paul writteth?"[71]

---

[70] Bernardino Ochino, *Fouretene Sermons of Barnardine Ochyne, Concernyng the Predestinacion and Eleccion of God, Very Expediente to the Settynge Forth of Hys Glorye Among Hys Creatures*, trans. A[nn?] C[ooke] (London: John Day and William Seres, [1550?]), [p. 2].

For Ochino the chief significance of the doctrine is that it shows man's salvation to be completely dependent upon God's grace. Ochino continually emphasizes the inability of man to attain salvation on his own. Before God, he is but "an unprofitable servant" who justly deserves damnation: "by the sins of Adam we are all lost, and he might justly damn us all."[72] Again, somewhat more graphically, "By the sin of Adam we were all defiled, infected, infirm, frail, blind, malignant, full of venum contrary to god, enemies and rebels--so that a thing more miserable could not have been chosen."[73]

It is the will and pleasure of God, however, which is the sole basis of election. "He saveth then his elect," he writes, "because he delighteth in them, and distributeth his mercy, after his own will."[74] Man's works and merits have nothing to do with God's choice. This view is summarized in the following passage from the sermon, "Wherefore God Hath Elected Us":

> Therefore looking in the holy scriptures, I find that god hath elected us by Christ, that is, that God looking in the progeny of Adam, saw nothing there that was worthy of our election: but turning the regard to his own goodness and Christ's, in whom he was so well pleased, that by him he did elect us, he therefore chose us not because we were holy, but because we should be, so that the divine grace found no saints but made

---

[71] Ibid., [pp. 3, 4].

[72] Ibid., [pp. 5, 10].

[73] Ibid., [p. 16].

[74] Ibid., [p. 77].

> saints...He chose us then because it pleased him so, for he loved us freely without seeing in us any thing worthy thereof.[75]

In this regard Ochino makes the rather interesting observation that were men given the choice of seeking salvation through their own efforts or of committing the same wholly to God, they would undoubtedly choose the latter, "for the greater glory to God, yea and also for their own proper commodity."[76] Indeed he writes, "Yea if mine election were in my custody, I would (if I might) render it unto God, in whose hand it must of force be better and more sure. Yea woe to us if in the least point it did depend upon our selves."[77] Man's salvation is most secure when it depends solely upon God, "because God incomparably doth love me more than I can do myself."[78]

As for assurance or the certification of election, in his sermon, "If We May Know in This Present Life, Whether We Be in the Grace of God, and One of His Elect or Not, and in What Manner," Ochino asserts that while one cannot know with certainty about the state of his neighbor, the elect can with all assurance know that he himself is among the chosen. This knowledge comes, he says, through the gift of a "lively faith." Good works may serve as a supplementary confirmation of election, since they are, to be sure, the "effects and fruits" of election; but in and of themselves good works may deceive. But those who possess a lively faith in Christ, "yea were it for a moment of time," may be completely sure of their election. Such faith cannot deceive. "They are elect and sons of God, and may be sure and certain, of their salvation."[79]

---

[75] _Ibid._, [pp. 72-73].

[76] _Ibid._, [p. 11].

[77] _Ibid._, [p. 78].

[78] _Ibid._, [p. 11].

There follows then in Ochino a passage strikingly reminiscent of one from Robert Barnes already quoted:

> If one only should be saved I would trust surely to be he, if all the men and angels would tell me that I were damned. I could not believe them, although they did allege all the reasons possible, but I would ever give more trust to Christ alone, who upon the cross, with his blood and death, doth tell me I am saved, then I would to all the rest, for he alone, hath more power in me, than all the reasons and authorities without him. Provided only that I see him with lively faith, dead for my salvation.[80]

In two later sermons Ochino asserts that not only is it beneficial to believe oneself to be among the elect, but it is, in fact, necessary to salvation to do so.[81]

Just as those who have a lively faith may be sure of their election, so likewise may the elect be sure of final salvation. God's purposes are certain and cannot be changed: "He cannot be letted or weakened, nor his will resisted."[82] Since the elect are "in the hands of God," they "can not perish, even as they can not be plucked out of his hands."[83] They may, of course, temporarily fall into sin, but they inevitably will rise again; for in the final analysis, "there is nothing that can let the election of God."[84] "That the elect then may be damned," he concludes, "is a thing false, heretical, and impossible.... Therefore if he be elect, he must needs be saved."[85]

---

[79] Ibid., [pp. 20, 21, 26].

[80] Ibid., [pp. 31-32]. Cf., supra, p. 17.

[81] Fouretene Sermons, [pp. 36 ff., 44 ff.].

[82] Ibid., [p. 81].

As for the negative side of predestination, Ochino declares that the discussion of reprobation is a totally unprofitable exercise. "Of the reprobate," he writes, "I intend not to dispute."[86] Notwithstanding, he does in fact deal with the subject, and in no fewer than five sermons.

In a sermon entitled "Whether God Do Aggravate, Harden, and Blind the Hearts of Men or Not, and in What Manner," Ochino categorically asserts that for the reprobate the preaching of the Gospel is the "odor of death." The Gospel only hurts and hinders the non-elect.[87] "And moreover," he adds elsewhere, "I say that Christ hideth himself and his grace many times from persons, so that although they seek him, cry after him, they find him not, nor he heareth them not."[88]

---

[83] Ibid., [p. 22].

[84] Ibid., [pp. 33, 96].

[85] Ibid., [p. 85].

[86] Ibid., [p. 79].

[87] Ibid., [p. 92].

[88] Ibid., [p. 99].

Ochino, like Augustine, is quick to explain, however, that God hardens the hearts of the reprobates only in the sense that he withholds from them his grace. Along this line he writes as follows:

> God doth blind men, when withdrawing his light, he hideth his face, and as Moses was veiled, so spreadeth he the veil of ignorance over the heart of the reprobate: so that god in withdrawing his light of his grace, blindeth the heart of infidels, in such sort, that not only the gospel is hid from them (as Paul writteth) and they err, but standing in that darkness, they cannot believe.[89]

As for the reason why God has elected some and not others, this is a question that is not to be inquired of by men. Such curiosity is especially evil when it is associated with the suspicion that God may err. "The godly knoweth certainly by faith," he writes, "that he [God] cannot err, and hereupon resteth."[90] "Wherefore honoring the bright and light judgements of God," he counsels, "let us believe that God doth not condemn, but with just and irreprehensible counsel, albeit the justice of his judgements be to us incomprehensible."[91]

To those who would feel sorry for the reprobate Ochino would answer: "Think you happily, to have more charity than God?" In any event, the reprobate "are in good custody, being in the hands of God."[92]

Karl Benrath, a nineteenth-century Ochino scholar, sees a significant Genevan influence upon Ochino's predestinarian views.[93] There are, of course, many points of similarity; and the fact that Ochino composed and first published his sermons in Geneva would tend to add some weight to such a theory. But it would appear that on the crucial issue of reprobation Ochino differs significantly from Calvin, moderating to a considerable extent, and in an Augustinian direction, the Genevan teaching. As a matter of fact, Ochino cites only biblical authorities in his sermons, basing his teaching overwhelmingly upon Saint Paul.

---

[89] *Ibid.*, [p. 93].

[90] *Ibid.*, [p. 53].

[91] *Ibid.*, [p. 80].

[92] *Ibid.*, [p. 64].

Evidence of the influence of Ochino's sermons in the Edwardian and following reigns comes from more than one source. Roger Ascham is said to have studied them in the original as a means of learning Italian.[94] John Clement, a Protestant prisoner under Mary, concluded the section on predestination in his "Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith," of 1556, with a recommendation of Ochino's fourteen sermons for those who should desire to learn more about the doctrine.[95] And from the dedication (to Queen Elizabeth) of Ochino's later treatment of predestination, entitled The Labyrinth, it is learned that the sermons had occasioned a discussion between the author and the then

---

[93] Karl Benrath, Bernardino Ochino, of Siena: A Contribution Towards the History of The Reformation, trans. Helen Zimmern (London: James Nisbet and Company, 1876), p. 151.

[94] Lawrence V. Ryan, Roger Ascham (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1963), p. 135.

[95] Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, III, ii, 463. Cf., infra, pp. 122-23.

Princess Elizabeth concerning some of the more obscure points of the doctrine.[96]

Peter Martyr Vermigli, like Ochino, was a Protestant reformer of Italian birth. He had been born in Florence and, like Luther, had become an Augustinian monk. In 1542 he fled Italy to escape religious persecution and visited Zurich and Basel before finally settling at Strasburg, on Bucer's invitation, as professor of Old Testament.

In 1547 Vermigli went to England along with Ochino. In March of the following year he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, from which post he exercised a considerable influence upon ecclesiastical affairs during Edward's reign. In 1553, upon the accession of Mary, he returned to the continent; but during the remaining nine years of his life he retained a keen interest in the affairs of the English Church.[97] Of all the continental reformers in England under Edward VI Vermigli was perhaps the most influential.[98]

Vermigli was much more of a scholar than Ochino, and his theological opinions were perhaps somewhat better grounded. By many of his contemporaries his theology was ranked alongside that of Calvin himself within the Reformed tradition.

---

[96] Benrath, Bernardino Ochino, p. 208.

[97] Alexander Gordon, "Pietro Martire Vermigli," Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Sidney Lee (London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1899), LVIII, 253-56.

[98] Smyth, Cranmer and the Reformation Under Edward VI, p. 117; and Frederick J. Smithen, Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation (London: James Clarke and Company, 1927), p. 106.

With regard to the doctrine of predestination, Vermigli's views first appeared in print in a commentary on Romans, published at Basel in 1558 and translated into English by one H. B(olton?) in 1568. Vermigli had treated the subject earlier, however, in his lectures at Oxford under Edward VI; and from a reference in a letter to Bullinger, dated November 3, 1553, it becomes clear that the views developed and formulated in the course of those lectures formed the basis of what was included in the later work. The following passage points out this connection, and suggests as well the basic orientation from which Vermigli approached the doctrine:

> But whereas I recollect that in a former letter you wrote me somewhat upon predestination, I will now content myself with replying, that in the treatment of that subject I have been especially on my guard, lest men should cast all their faults and sins upon God, or derive from the will of God an excuse for their wickedness: and for the rest, I so treat it, as to follow the holy scriptures as closely as possible. But I have now neither room nor opportunity to dwell longer upon the subject. You will perceive the nature of what I have taught, as soon as I shall have published my commentaries on the Romans. I must however candidly confess, that I cannot but lament that our churches are agitated from time to time by new controversies: we have had, I think, quite disputing enough. May God of his goodness grant us all so to feel respecting predestination, that what ought to be the greatest consolation to believers, may not become the painful subject of pernicious contention! As far as I am concerned, I am not of such an obstinate opinion in these matters, as that if an opinion differing from my own were pointed out to me from the sacred writings, I should refuse to yield to the truth.[99]

While Vermigli touched upon predestination at several points in his textual annotations, the heart of his teaching was contained in a special treatise, entitled "Of Predestination," which he inserted into the body of his commentary, following immediately upon his discussion of the ninth chapter. The treatise was also included in his later Common Places, which was first published at Zurich in 1563, and which appeared in London in Latin editions in 1576 and 1583, and in an English translation by Anthony Marten also in 1583.

---

[99] Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, pp. 506-507.

In the first section of his treatise Vermigli deals with the definition and nature of predestination. As with Augustine, predestination for him "pertaineth only unto the saints, and unto the elect."[100] He takes "purpose" to be the general term, "common both to predestination and reprobation." It consists of the good pleasure and will of God.[101] Predestination, consequently, is defined as

> The most wise purpose of God, whereby he hath from the beginning, constantly decreed to call all those, whom he hath loved in Christ, to the adoption of his children, to justification by faith, and at the length to glory through good works, that they may be made like unto the image of the Son of God: and that in them may be declared the glory and mercy of the creator.[102]

Or as he puts it in his commentary on Romans:

> Election is, whereby he [God] preferreth one before an other. Predestination is, whereby he directeth those whom he hath so

---

[100] Peter Martyr Vermigli, The Common Places of the Most Famous and Renouned Divine Doctor Peter Martyr [Hereinafter referred to as Common Places], trans. Anthonie Marten (London: Henrie Denham, Thomas Chard, William Broome, and Andrew Maunfell, 1583), iii, 8. The Common Places version of Vermigli's treatise has been used as it is somewhat better structured and organized.

[101] Common Places, iii, 9.

[102] Ibid.

> loved and preferred before others, to the end which he hath appointed unto them, namely, unto eternal life, by apt means.[103]

In the second section of the treatise Vermigli deals with what he elsewhere refers to as the "weightiest matter of all"--the problem of the cause of election and predestination. Following Augustine once again he categorically affirms that the good pleasure and will of God is the sole cause of election.[104] In fact, the chief burden of his exposition of the ninth chapter of Romans in his commentary would seem to be to make crystal clear this very point, that there is no other basis for election--nor indeed for rejection--than the sole will of God. Man's works and faith, both actual and foreseen, are denied to have any bearing upon God's choice. Rather, the "liberality and mercy of God is utterly free from all laws, so that it is bound to no man, but...freely either rejecteth or electeth whom it will."[105] Commenting upon the passage concerning Jacob and Esau, Vermigli stresses the point that the distinction between the two must be attributed solely to God's will and pleasure.[106] "There is nothing at all in us," he writes, "whereby God should be moved to bestow these things upon us."[107]

---

[103] *Most Learned and Fruitfull Commentaries of D. Peter Martir Vermilius Florentine, Professor of Divinitie in the Schole of Tigure, Upon the Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes* [Hereinafter referred to as *Commentaries on Romans*], trans. H. B[olton?] (London: John Day, 1568), fol. 258b.

[104] *Common Places*, iii, 18.

[105] *Commentaries on Romans*, fol. 248a.

[106] *Ibid*.

[107] *Ibid*., fol. 262b.

As for those who are elected, they most certainly are saved, for God's election and predestination are "fixed and unchangeable."[108] But the necessity by which God's decrees come to pass does not compromise the basic freedom of men; rather it is a necessity of "certainty and infallibleness."[109] Men are not "stocks and stones," being "against our wills compelled"; but rather they are "persuaded" by God's Spirit according to the determinations of His will.[110] To the elect, God's calling is "a convenient, apt, and mighty calling, whereby the minds are touched, and truly changed."[111]

Just as election and predestination are based solely in God's good pleasure, so reprobation likewise proceeds directly from God's will. "So also must we think of the wicked," he writes, "namely, that God appointeth them also unto their end."[112] But reprobation for Vermigli, as for Ochino, is not a positive affair in the Calvinistic sense. Rather, it is basically a negative matter of God withholding his grace, much in the sense of Augustine's teaching. "Wherefore when God is said to harden," he explains, "thereby we ought to understand, that he will not have mercy."[113] Vermigli sums up his view in the following definition of reprobation:

---

[108] Ibid., fol. 278a.

[109] Common Places, iii, 35.

[110] Commentaries on Romans, fol. 261a.

[111] Ibid., fol. 256b.

[112] Ibid., fol. 243b.

[113] Ibid., fol. 271a.

> Wherefore reprobation is the most wise purpose of God, whereby he hath before all eternity, constantly decreed without any injustice, not to have mercy on those whom he hath not loved, but hath overhipped [overlooked] them; that by their just condemnation, he might declare his wrath towards sins, and also his glory.[114]

While man's sins thus are not the cause of reprobation, "yet are they the cause of eternal damnation, whereunto the reprobate are ordained."[115] Vermigli sees a clear distinction between reprobation and damnation, and with regard to the latter man is quite culpable.

As for the cause of sin itself, Vermigli, somewhat uniquely, comes rather close to admitting that it is God. God cannot be excluded, he says, from "the government and ordering of sins: for he is the cause of those actions which to us are sins."[116] The very fact that God permits sin is proof that he wills such, for nothing takes place against his will.[117] Furthermore, God "wonderfully bendeth the hearts of men," he writes, "not only to good, but also...by his just judgement to evil."[118]

Vermigli is quick to point out, however, that such power of God is not "tyrannical or strange from justice": "For the will of God is the first and chief justice, so that whatsoever he willeth, the same straightway is of necessity just."[119] The same rule applies to the matter of election and reprobation in general. Employing the analogy of a creditor and his debtors, which he borrows from Augustine, Vermigli rationalizes God's choice of some but not all on the basis that "in giving unto some freely, he defraudeth not them of any thing due, whom he omitteth."[120] In the final analysis, however, it must be admitted that God's justice in election and reprobation is beyond the comprehension of human reason.

---

[114] Common Places, iii, 11.

[115] Commentaries on Romans, fol. 258b.

[116] Common Places, iii, 11.

[117] Commentaries on Romans, fol. 257a.

[118] Common Places, iii, 11.

Such then is the doctrine which Vermigli expounds; and to him it is basically one of great utility and commodity. Among the manifold benefits which he finds in the doctrine are that in the case of the elect it prevents despair in adversity and keeps human pride in check.[121] Most important of all, of course, is its value in pointing toward, confirming, and safeguarding the free grace of God in salvation. This, in fact, seems to be the primary orientation of Vermigli's treatment.[122] "Free justification also should perish," he writes, "except we be rightly taught of predestination."[123] For the above reasons, and because the doctrine is "a certain part of the Gospel," it is "indifferently to be set forth to the learned, and to the unlearned." It must not be preached only in part, but rather "fully and wholly."[124]

---

[119] Commentaries on Romans, fols. 257b, 274b.

[120] Ibid., fol. 42a.

[121] Ibid., fol. 3a.

[122] Joseph C. McClelland, "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination, According to Peter Martyr," Scottish Journal of Theology, VIII, No. 3 (September, 1955), 261.

[123] Vermigli, Common Places, iii, 3.

As with Ochino, Vermigli's views have also been labeled Calvinistic.[125] However, he differs from Calvin's teaching perhaps even more than Ochino; and again, it is primarily at the crucial point of reprobation. Vermigli is much more openly dependent in this regard upon Augustine for his views than Ochino. In fact, Vermigli cites the Bishop of Hippo and other early Christian writers quite frequently and at times in some detail.

It is nevertheless probably accurate to say that the opinions of Ochino and Vermigli were the most predestinarian yet to be expressed in the English Reformation. While they were not properly Calvinistic, yet they did represent a rather strong expression of the teaching of the Augustinian-moderate Reformed tradition. The circulation of these views in England doubtlessly contributed substantially, not only toward making the doctrine the more important issue that it was becoming, but also to the development now becoming apparent of a more consistent and strongly predestinarian position in English Reformation theology.

---

[124] Ibid., pp. 4-5.

[125] Smithen, Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation, p. 110.

## The Edwardian Formularies

There remains now for the Edwardian period only to examine the group of doctrinal and liturgical formularies which were issued in that reign. Drawn up by the leading divines of the day, under Cranmer's superintendency, the formularies set forth what perhaps may be taken as the official doctrinal position of the English Church in that period. They include the First Book of Homilies of 1547, the Edwardian Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, and the Edwardian Primer, the Edwardian Catechism, the Forty-Two Articles, and the Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws, all of 1553. While the formularies generally are not remarkable for any definite statements on predestination, they do nevertheless serve to define the doctrine which by authority was established. The treatment of the subject in the Forty-Two Articles is of special significance in this regard.

The First Book of Homilies was issued, by authority of the King's Council, in July, 1547, although the plan for setting forth such a work dated back as far as 1542. The compilation consisted of twelve discourses, of which at least half were of an essentially practical nature; and it was intended primarily for the use of the less educated clergy. Cranmer was probably responsible for the authorship of at least four of the discourses, and he certainly set the over-all tone for the entire work.

These earliest homilies contained no direct treatment of the doctrine of predestination. It perhaps was thought too high and mysterious a matter to be handled by the ignorant clergy and uneducated masses. They did, however, touch briefly upon certain related topics. In the homily entitled "Of the Misery of All Mankind," composed by one Archdeacon John Harpesfield of London, the basically sinful nature of man and his inability to attain salvation on his own is affirmed. In and of themselves men are but "sinful, wretched, and damnable"--"the children of God's wrath."[126] Cranmer's homily, "of the Salvation of Mankind," adds that it is solely "by God's mercy" that men are justified and saved.[127]

The homily, "Of Declining from God," author unknown, is interesting in that it implies by its very title the possibility of falling from grace. Indeed, a total and complete fall is contemplated when it is said that if admonitions, threatenings, and plagues fail to direct fallen man back into the fold, then finally "he [God] will let us lie waste, he will give us over, he will turn away from us, he will dig and delve no more about us, he will let us alone."[128]

The First Prayer Book of Edward VI appeared in 1549. It was soon superceded, however, by the revised Prayer Book of 1552. The later work may be taken to represent the mature expression of the liturgical and, to a limited extent, the doctrinal ideas of the English reformers, and especially Cranmer. One does not, of course, expect to find nice definitions of doctrine in a liturgy, but such compositions often provide important clues as to the theological assumptions and presuppositions of the authors.

---

[126] _Certain Sermons, or Homilies, Appoynted by the Kynges Maiestie, To Be Declared and Redde, by All Personnes, Vicars, or Curates, Every Sonday in Their Churches, Where Thei Have Cure_ (London: Rychard Grafton, 1547), [pp. 21, 23].

[127] _Ibid._, [p. 25].

[128] _Ibid._, [p. 117].

Predestination, again, was not directly dealt with in the Prayer Book; but, as before, there are a few passages touching upon related doctrines. The Book of Common Prayer (1552 edition) assumes and teaches throughout a doctrine of original sin. Man is "born in original sin and in the wrath of God"; spiritually speaking, "we have no power of ourselves to help ourselves." For salvation, man is completely dependent upon God, "because the weakness of our mortal nature can do no good thing without thee."[129]

But God's grace and mercy are "bountiful" and are offered in "abundance." Grace is made available to "prevent and follow us," to "lighten the darkness of our heart," and to "lead us to all things profitable to our salvation."[130] Indeed, God wills not the death of a sinner, "but rather that he should be converted and live." Christ's

---

[129] Order of Private Baptism, Collect for the Second Sunday in Lent, and Collect for the First Sunday After Trinity, The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552, with Other Documents Set Forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI, ed. Joseph Ketley (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1846), pp. 245, 252, 292.

[130] Collect for the Fourth Sunday in Advent, Collect for the Twelfth Sunday After Trinity, Collect for the Seventeenth Sunday After Trinity, Collect for the Third Sunday in Advent, and Collect for the Fifteenth Sunday After Trinity, The Two Liturgies, pp. 240, 255, 256.

"one oblation of himself once offered" has made "a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."[131]

However, in the Order of Public Baptism the minister prays that the baptized "may receive the fulness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children"; and in the Order for the Burial of the Dead the minister petitions God to "suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to fall from thee."[132] The possibility of falling from God's grace, even in the very hour of death, is thus plainly indicated.

In the closely related Edwardian Primer of the following year (1543), at least one prayer--"For the Glory of Heaven"--touched upon some of the chief themes related to predestination:

> The joys, O Lord, which thou has prepared for them that love thee, no eye hath seen, no ear hath heard, neither is any heart able to think. But as the joys are great and unspeakable, so are there few that do enjoy them: for strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. Notwithstanding, O heavenly Father, thou hast a little flock to whom it is thy pleasure to give the glorious kingdom of heaven. There is a certain number of sheep, that hear thy voice, whom no man is able to pluck out of thy hand, which shall never perish, to whom also thou shalt give eternal life. Make me therefore, O Lord, of that number, whom thou from everlasting hast predestinate to be saved, whose names also are written in the book of life. Pluck me out of the company of the stinking goats, which shall stand on thy

---

[131] Collect for Good Friday, and Order of the Ministration of Holy Communion (Prayer of Consecration), The Two Liturgies, pp. 247, 279.

[132] The Two Liturgies, pp. 289, 319.

> left hand and be damned, and place me among those sheep, which shall stand on thy right hand and be saved. Grant me this, O merciful Father, for thy dear Son's sake, Jesus Christ our Lord. So shall I, enjoying this singular benefit at thy hand, and being placed in thy glorious kingdom, sing perpetual praises to thy godly majesty, which livest and reignest with thy dearly beloved Son, and the Holy Ghost, one true and everlasting God, world without end. Amen.[133]

Such then are the ideas expressed in the liturgical setting on some of the issues related to predestination. Nor did the Edwardian Catechism deal more directly with the doctrine. Entitled *A Short Catechism, or Plain Instruction, Containing the Sum of Christian Learning*, and attributed variously to Alexander Nowell and John Ponet, the catechism was published and bound together with the Forty-Two Articles by royal authority in 1553. Apart from a short reference to the doctrine of original sin, the catechism contents itself with the statement that "as many as are in this faith stedfast, were forechosen, predestinate, and appointed out to everlasting life, before the world was made. Witness hereof they have within their hearts the Spirit of Christ, the author, earnest and unfailable pledge of their faith."[134]

The most important doctrinal statement of the Edwardian period was, of course, the Forty-Two Articles. As early as 1551 Cranmer had been commissioned to prepare a new doctrinal formulary; and it generally is assumed that the composition of the first draft of the document was his work. In the later stages of authorship the assistance of Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley is believed to have been especially significant.

---

[133] *Ibid.*, p. 475.

[134] *Ibid.*, p. 511.

The formulary was first published in a separate edition in May, 1553, and shortly thereafter in another edition, bound together with the Edwardian Catechism.

In spite of the title, *Articles Agreed on by the Bishops and Other Learned Men in the Synod at London, in the Year of Our Lord God MDLII, for the Avoiding of Controversy in Opinions, and the Establishment of a Godly Concord in Certain Matters of Religion*, there is some question as to whether or not the Forty-Two Articles were ever submitted to the Convocation. It is more than likely that they were promulgated solely by royal authority. At any rate, within a month Edward VI was dead, and any orders for assent to the new formulary were consequently abortive. Whatever the nature of its official authority, however, the formulary is extremely important as an indication of the consensus of theological opinion among the chief leaders of the Edwardian Church.

The Forty-Two Articles were basically an attempt to define the doctrinal position of the Church of England with reference to the chief theological controversies of the sixteenth century. They were not meant to form a complete system of theology, but were intended to treat only those points which were actually in dispute at the time. As is indicated by the title, they were agreed upon "for the Avoiding of Controversy in Opinions, and the Establishment of a Godly Concord in Certain Matters of Religion."

The problems associated with the doctrine of predestination were treated in some detail in the new articles. The eighth article, "Of Original, or Birth Sin," defines original sin as "the fault and corruption of the nature of every man...whereby man is very far gone from his former righteousness, which he had at his creation, and is of his own nature given to evil." Such is the seriousness of this condition that every man "deserveth God's wrath and damnation."[135]

The ninth article, "Of Free Will," consists of the single following sentence, which was probably taken from a passage in Augustine's Treatise on Grace and Free-Will: "We have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ, preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working in us when we have that will."[136] Continuing the Augustinian line the tenth article, "Of Grace," affirms that God's grace "doth take away the stony heart, and giveth an heart of flesh. And although those that have no will to good things, he maketh them to will; and those that would evil things, he maketh them not to will the same: yet nevertheless he enforceth not the will."[137]

The fifteenth article, "Of Sin Against the Holy Ghost," contains the observation that "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin." To this is added the somewhat ambiguous consolation that "by the grace of God we *may* rise again and amend our lives."[138] The wording of this article was to prove a matter of some concern to the more rigid predestinarians of the Elizabethan period.[139]

---

[135] Ibid., pp. 527-28.

[136] Ibid., p. 528. Cf., Augustine, The Anti-Pelagian Works of Saint Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, trans. Peter Holmes and Robert Ernest Wallis, vols. IV, XII, XV of The Works of Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, ed. Marcus Dods (3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872, 1874, 1876), III, 49.

[137] The Two Liturgies, p. 528.

Finally, the formulary contained a few scattered references concerning the extent of Christ's death which are of some significance. The second article refers in passing to Christ's death as being "a sacrifice for all sin of man, both original, and actual." The fourteenth article asserts that Christ's sacrifice "made once for ever, should take away the sins of the world." And the thirtieth article states that "the offering of Christ, made once for ever, is the perfect redemption, the pacifying of God's displeasure and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual."[140]

---

[138] *Ibid*., p. 529. Italic mine.

[139] A Puritan objection of c.1583 criticized the teaching of the article "that a man after he hath received the holy Ghost may fall from grace," as being "contrary unto the certainty of God his election." *A Parte of a Register, Contayninge Sundrie Memorable Matters, Written by Divers Godly and Learned in Our Time, Which Stand for, and Desire the Reformation of Our Church* ([Middelburg: R. Schilders, 1593]), pp. 552-53. For further objections *cf*., Walter Howard Frere and Charles Edward Douglas, eds., *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origins of the Puritan Revolt* (The Church Historical Society publications; London: S.P.C.K., 1954), p. 118; and *The Second Parte of a Register, Being a Calendar of Manuscripts Under That Title Intended for Publication by the Puritans About 1593, and Now in Dr. William's Library, London*, ed. Albert Peel (2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1915), I, 197.

[140] *The Two Liturgies*, pp. 526, 529, 534.

It was the seventeenth article, "Of Predestination, and Election," however, which dealt specifically and in detail with the doctrine of predestination. And it would appear to be quite significant that of the forty-two, the seventeenth was by far the most lengthy. If the formulary was, in fact, composed from the point of view of the issues and controversies of the day, then the relative length of this article, coupled with the fact that the Henrician formularies had not dealt directly with predestination, would suggest quite a lot, it would seem, concerning the importance which the doctrine had come to assume as a theological issue in the Edwardian period.

The text of the seventeenth article is as follows:

> Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed, by his own judgment, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen out of mankind; and to bring them to everlasting salvation by Christ, as vessels made to honour. Whereupon such as have so excellent a benefit of God given unto them, be called, according to God's purpose, by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons by adoption: they be made like the image of God's only begotten Son, Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works: and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.
>
> As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things; as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: So for curious, and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall: whereby the Devil may thrust them either into

> desperation, or into a rechlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.
>
> Furthermore, although the decrees of predestination are unknown unto us; yet we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy scripture: and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.[141]

By way of analysis, the first paragraph of the article consists of a definition of predestination, along with a description of the steps which accompany it. The extent to which the paragraph is couched in the actual words of the Scriptures is perhaps its most significant characteristic.[142] It exhibits little more than a series of texts, held together by a few connecting words and phrases.[143] In fact, one must conclude that perhaps a mere reflection upon the language of the Scriptures is all that is intended, rather than an interpretation of the doctrine as such. It is a positive doctrine of election that is defined and asserted.

The second paragraph deals with the practical effects of predestination. Even as the doctrine is profitable when considered in a godly manner, offering assurance of salvation to the elect, so is it dangerous when considered otherwise, leading curious and carnal persons into either desperation or the unclean living of presumptuous security.

---

[141] Ibid., p. 530.

[142] Edgar C. S. Gibson, The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, Explained with an Introduction (2nd ed., rev.; London: Methuen and Company, 1898), pp. 363-64.

[143] Cf., especially, Ephesians i, 3-12; and Romans viii, 28-30 and ix, 21.

The third and final paragraph consists of two considerations calculated to guard the doctrine against abuse. Although God's decrees be unknown to man, yet his promises must be taken in the general (i.e., having to do with all men) sense in which they are set forth in the Scriptures. That is, on the practical level, predestination must always be interpreted in the light of God's universal offer of salvation--his will that all men should be saved. Further, the revealed, as opposed to the secret, will of God must be the ultimate guide for life.

Perhaps the most important thing about the seventeenth article, however, is what is left unsaid. Dealing exclusively with "predestination to life," the article contains no mention of reprobation. Nor have attempts to read such a doctrine into the article by implication been successful. Any negative aspects of predestination were perhaps felt best to be left within the realm of God's mysteries.

The situation thus seems to have been that predestination came increasingly into discussion and dispute during the Edwardian period; a statement was needed on the subject; and this moderate and positive pronouncement was as far as the leaders of the Edwardian Church were willing officially to commit themselves. In fact, the seventeenth of the Forty-Two Articles represents as much as the English Church was ever to say officially on the subject. To the Anglican mind, the article incorporates as much as the believer needs to know about God's holy mystery.

What, then, can be said concerning the interpretation of the seventeenth article? It has, of course, been variously interpreted as Calvinistic, Lutheran, Arminian, etc. It goes without saying that the Arminian interpretation is an anachronism and as such a failure. The Calvinistic and Lutheran theses are at least worthy of closer consideration. It should be pointed out here, however, that what is important for the purposes of this study is not how the article is _capable_ of being interpreted, but what, insofar as such can be determined, were the intentions of the original Edwardian authors.

There has been much discussion concerning the question whether or not the seventeenth article is Calvinistic. A host of reputable scholars down to the present day have insisted that that is the only proper interpretation. Benjamin B. Warfield writes that "the whole is not only soundly Reformed but distinctly Calvinian in substance."[144] Likewise, Philip Schaff concludes that "it can not be naturally understood in any other than an Augustinian or moderately Calvinistic sense." He adds that "the remarks of the Article about the 'sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort' of our election in Christ, and the caution against abuse by carnal persons, are consistent only with the Calvinistic interpretation."[145]

---

[144] Benjamin Breckenridge Warfield, "Predestination in the Reformed Confessions," _The Presbyterian and Reformed Review_, XII, No. 45 (January, 1901), 66.

[145] Philip Schaff, _Bibliotheca Symbolica Ecclesiae Universalis: The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes_ [Hereinafter referred to as _The Creeds of Christendom_] (6th ed., rev. and enl.; 3 vols.; New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1931), I, 634-35.

There are, however, some serious objections to such an interpretation. The one bit of historical evidence supporting the Calvinistic thesis is the letter from Traheron to Bullinger, in which it was suggested that those holding Calvin's views were in the majority among the Edwardian reformers, and that Calvin's *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God* was a determining influence in the discussions leading toward the framing of the article.[146] But, as has already been pointed out, this evidence is not elsewhere confirmed. Beyond Traheron's statement there is no additional evidence that would suggest that Calvin's predestinarian views attained any significant degree of acceptance in Edwardian England. Certainly none of the leading reformers--those primarily responsible for the composition of the formulary--held Calvin's views on the subject.

Internally, the strongest evidence against the Calvinistic interpretation is the lack of any mention of reprobation. And if Traheron was correct in saying that Calvin's treatise of 1552 was known to the compilers, then the article's apparently deliberate silence on this aspect of the doctrine is all the more striking and damaging to the Calvinistic thesis; for this was perhaps the most distinctive feature of Calvin's doctrine. Likewise, the final clauses of the article would appear effectively to rule out any Calvinistic interpretation. One need only compare the article with something like Calvin's *Articles Concerning Predestination* to fully appreciate its relative moderation.

---

[146] *Cf.*, *supra*, p. 38.

A final argument against the Calvinistic interpretation is the fact that the English Calvinists themselves, under Elizabeth, were never satisfied with the article, which was left virtually unchanged in its Elizabethan version. A Puritan protest of 1584 asks "whether the 17th afticle, speaking of election, be well put down, that maketh no mention of reprobation, seeing Paul, speaking of the one, speaketh of the other? And whether the doctrine of predestination of itself is dangerous, and may cause a dangerous downfall to any, as is put down in the articles?"[147] Indeed, the entire controversy which resulted in the preparation of the Lambeth Articles of 1595 is witness to the dissatisfaction of the Puritan-Calvinists with the form and content of the article.

It would appear then that the Calvinistic interpretation is rather inadequate. Some of Calvin's views are, of course, paralleled in the article; but they are mainly such as are common to the basic Pauline-Augustinian and Reformed traditions.

As for the Lutheran interpretation, that centers chiefly around the relationship of the article to the work of Philip Melanchthon. Melanchthon's influence on many of the articles, via the Augsburg Confession, is indisputable; but since the Lutheran confession contained no article on predestination, the question of his influence on the seventeenth article as such is not so clear cut.

The chief advocate of a Lutheran, or Melanchthonian, interpretation was the nineteenth-century archbishop and historian Richard

---

[147] _The Seconde Parte of a Register_, I, 197. _Cf._, also, p. 94.

Laurence. His position is that the article was "framed in perfect conformity with the...opinions of the Lutherans."[148] In fact, Laurence suggests that it was probably Melanchthon who originally persuaded Cranmer to give the article the form it acquired. Upon being consulted by Cranmer in 1548 concerning the compilation of a public creed, Melanchthon urged caution and moderation with regard to any statement on predestination.[149]

Beyond this, the supporters of the Melanchthonian theory call attention to numerous points of similarity, in both ideas and language. Indeed, the concluding paragraph of the article bear a remarkable resemblance to a passage from Melanchthon, where he writes, "And if other things may be nicely disputed concerning election, yet it is well for godly men to hold that the promise is universal. Nor ought we to judge otherwise concerning the will of God than according to the revealed word, and we ought to know what God hath commanded that we may believe."[150] But this seems to be the only point of really close similarity; and while it is conceivable that Melanchthon may have been the original inspiration here, it would probably be saying too much to attribute the entire article to his influence. Perhaps it is sufficient to say that in its caution and moderation the article was closely akin to the Melanchthonian spirit.

---

[148] Richard Laurence, An Attempt to Illustrate Those Articles of the Church of England Which the Calvinists Improperly Consider as Calvinistical, in Eight Sermons (The Bampton Lectures, 1804; 3rd ed., rev. and enl.; Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1838), p. 170.

[149] Ibid., p. 374; Melanchthon, Opera, VI, 801.

[150] Melanchthon, Disputationes Theologicae in Schola Propositae et Fideliter Explicatae, in Opera, XII, 481. "Etsi alia subtiliter de electione disputari fortasse possunt, tamen produst piis tenere, quod promissio sit universalis, nec debemus de voluntate Dei aliter judicare, quam juxta verbum revelatum, et scire debemus, quod Deus praecepirit, ut credamus."

It is altogether possible, and indeed quite probable, that the most direct continental influence on the framing of the seventeenth article came neither from Geneva nor from Wittenberg, but from England itself in the person of Peter Martyr Vermigli. His definition of predestination, probably arrived at during the course of his stay in England, is very close to that given in the first paragraph of the article.[151] Likewise, the emphasis upon the positive side of the doctrine is in keeping with his general approach, although he did, of course, mention reprobation. The opportunity provided by his presence in England and his close intimacy with and considerable influence upon Cranmer and the other English reformers only serves to strengthen such a theory.

Finally, it is important to remember that above all else the article must be related to the known sentiments of its actual compilers. In this regard the cautious and moderate exposition of a positive doctrine of predestination is quite in line with the Augustinian and perhaps moderately Reformed development of the doctrine in the writings of the major Edwardian reformers. The article is probably most accurately described as the work of the English reformers themselves, drawing upon varied sources, not the least important of which was the Holy Scriptures. Insofar as they do draw upon the ideas and works of contemporary continental Protestants, the influence of Melanchthon and Vermigli, and of the moderate tradition which in this regard they in a sense shared together, would seem to have been the most significant.

---

[151] _Cf._, _supra_, p. 70.

The last of the Edwardian formularies to be considered is the document resulting from the attempt to reform the ecclesiastical laws of the English Church, the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*. As early as 1533 an act had been passed enabling Henry VIII to appoint a committee for the compilation of a new code of ecclesiastical laws. Similar acts had again been passed in 1535 and 1543. In 1549 new authority was obtained for the project when Edward VI was empowered to appoint a commission of thirty-two persons to carry out the work. It was actually undertaken, however, in 1551 by a smaller group of eight persons especially selected from the larger commission. This committee was headed by Cranmer and included in addition Thomas Goodrich, Richard Cox, William May, Rowland Taylor, John Lucas, Richard Goodrick, and, interestingly, Peter Martyr Vermigli.

The work of the committee was completed by the early part of 1553 and was presented to the Parliament in March of that year. The death of Edward VI, however, occurred before the project could be ratified. Under Elizabeth it again was considered, and was edited for publication by John Foxe in 1571; but the ill-fated document never received legal ratification.

Although the document thus never acquired authoritative force, it is nevertheless important as an additional insight into the development of doctrine in the Edwardian period. It is especially significant in that it was in the process of construction at the same time as the Forty-Two Articles and was probably the work of essentially the same hands. Indeed, in its doctrinal sections it treats many of the same topics as were included in the Edwardian Articles. It therefore occasionally serves as a contemporary exposition of the Articles and in not a few cases provides expanded versions of the same.

The _Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum_ included two sections dealing specifically with matters of doctrine, the first containing positive expositions of certain selected doctrines, and the second, negative warnings against the dangers of certain heretical opinions. The treatment of predestination comprised the final chapter of the latter section. The context is significant because, rather than a positive statement on the doctrine, what was set forth was a strong denunciation and condemnation of certain erroneous views then prevalent.

The chapter begins with a warning against those who would seek in God's eternal decrees "concealment for their misdeeds and iniquities"--those who would "place the blame for their guilt on the will of God."[152] "No one can attain purgation of his own iniquities out of this situation (i.e., by reference to God's decrees), because God has ordained nothing unjustly in any way, nor forced our wills to sin in any way involuntarily."[153] Paralleling the seventeenth of the Forty-Two Articles, it is said that such as are overly and improperly concerned with the matter--those "who are always talking about predestination and rejection"--are led eventually into either "desperation" or "a certain free and easy security of life."[154]

---

[152] _The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws as Attempted in the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth_, ed. Edward Cardwell (new ed.; Oxford: The University of Oxford Press, 1850), p. 21. "...latebram suis maleficiis et sceleribus"; "...in voluntatem Dei criminum suorum culpam conferunt."

By way of contrast, and again paralleling the seventeenth article, "diligent and accurate thought about our predestination and received election" is said to "delight pious men's souls" because it "confirms our faith regarding the eternal salvation coming to us through Christ," it "kindles the most ardent flames of love for God," it "marvelously arouses us to thanksgiving," and it "brings us as close as possible to good works and takes us as far as possible from sins."[155]

---

[153] The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws, p. 22. "...neminem ex hoc loco purgationem censemus vitiorum suorum afferre posse; quia Deus nihil ulla in re injuste constituit, nec ad peccata voluntates nostras unquam invitas trudit."

[154] The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws, p. 21. "...semper praedestinationem, et rejectionem, vel, ut usitate loquuntur, reprobationem in sermone jactant"; "...solutans quandam et mollem vitae securitatem."

[155] The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws, pp. 22-22. "...diligens et accurata cogitatio de praedestinatione nostra et electione suscepta...piorum hominum animos...permulcet, quoniam fidem nostram de perpetua salute per Christum ad nos perventura confirmat, vehementissimas charitatis in Deum flammas accendit, mirabiliter ad gratias agendas exsuscitat, ad bona nos opera propinquissime adducit, et a peccatis longissime abducit."

The chapter finally ends with an exhortation markedly similar to that at the end of the seventeenth article:

> Therefore all are to be warned by us, not to refer themselves in deeds to be undertaken to decrees of predestination, but to adapt the whole manner of their life to the laws of God, when they have considered carefully both the promises for the good and the threats to the evil generally set forth in the Holy Scriptures. For we ought to enter the worship of God in those ways, and dwell on that will of God which we see has been revealed in the Holy Scriptures.[156]

Thus, by way of summary there are several things which may be said about the development of the doctrine of predestination in the Edwardian period of the English Reformation. In the first place, it has become increasingly obvious that the earliest English reformers--Henrician and Edwardian as well--unlike their continental counterparts, were not overly interested in the doctrine. They seem rather to have taken it up as a component part of the Augustinian-reformed theological system which they inherited. Interest in and discussion of the doctrine did, however, expand noticeably during the Edwardian period; and toward the latter half of that reign the doctrine was clearly in the air in a significant way.

Insofar as the doctrine was discussed in the Edwardian period, the basic tendency, as in the previous reign, was toward moderation.

---

[156] The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws, p. 22. "Quapropter omnes nobis admonendi sunt, ut in actionibus suscipiendis ad decreta praedestinationis se non referant, sed universam vitae suae rationem ad Dei leges accommodent; cum et promissiones bonis, et minas malis, in sacris Scripturis generaliter propositas contemplentur. Debemus enim ad Dei cultum viis illis ingredi, et in illa Dei voluntate commorari, quam in sacris Scripturis patefactam esse videmus."

It was essentially the same Augustinian-moderately Reformed version of the doctrine which predominated, most of the reformers falling into some such general category. Such is certainly the case with Lamberd; the translations of Augustine, Ochino, and Vermigli; and the Edwardian formularies. And the chief variations from this tended even further in the direction of moderation, as in the case of the Melanchthonianism of Hooper, the deliberate restraint of Latimer, and the outright anti-predestinarianism of the Freewillers.

As for the influence of the Calvinist doctrine, apart from Traheron there is no evidence of a general acceptance of the Genevan position in this period. Perhaps the closest approach to such a position came with Ochino and Vermigli; but they clearly differed with Calvin on the crucial point of reprobation. Alfred Frederick Pollard is probably correct in his general assertion that "it was not till Elizabeth's reign, after the return of the Marian exiles from Geneva, that Calvin exercised any great influences on the English Church."[157]

---

[157] Alfred Frederick Pollard, Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation, 1489-1556 (Heroes of the Reformation series; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), p. 270.

# CHAPTER III

# THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION AMONG THE MARIAN PROTESTANTS

The premature death of Edward VI in 1553 was a tremendous blow to the English Reformation. After the miserable failure of a plot to set aside the legal succession, Edward's older half-sister acceded to the throne as Queen Mary I. The new sovereign's almost fanatical determination to ensure that the English people be recovered, willingly or by force, to the Catholic fold brought a striking and tragic end to the progress of reform throughout the country.

There were generally two options open to the English Protestants upon Mary's accession. On the one hand, some eight hundred persons chose to take refuge at the centers of Protestantism on the continent, where by and large they came under the direct influence of the various Reformed leaders and theologians. On the other hand, a great number of reformers, including most of the leading ones, chose to remain in England as witnesses to their Protestant faith.

## The Predestinarian Controversy Among the Prisoners for Religion

Within a few months of Mary's accession such of the reformers as had not sought sanctuary abroad were upon one pretext or another arrested and imprisoned, including the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley were eventually taken to Oxford, while the remainder of the reformers were divided up among the various prisons in London. There they awaited the martyrdom that most of them suffered during the course of the next few years.

It was among those reformers imprisoned in London's King's Bench prison that the chief controversy on the issue of predestination in the pre-Elizabethan period of the English Reformation occurred. Imprisoned there were such reformers as Robert Ferrar, Bishop of Saint David's; John Bradford, chaplain to Bishop Ridley; John Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester; and Rowland Taylor, parson of Hadleigh in Suffolk and Archdeacon of Exeter. In the same prison were also several of the key leaders of the Edwardian Freewill group, including Henry Hart, Humphrey Middleton, Cuthbert Sympson, John Trewe, Nicholas Sheterden, Thomas Abingdon, John Kemp, John Gibson, and one Chamberlain. It was probably the circumstance of these two groups, the Freewillers and the other more predestinarian of the reformers, being brought together in the close quarters of the prison situation that precipitated the bitter and almost scandalous controversy which now developed within the Protestant ranks.

The exact details of the controversy are somewhat difficult to arrive at. The primary source of information is a manuscript in the Bodleian Library containing several of the tracts and treatises which were issued during the course of the debate.[1] Some of the more important of these have been transcribed and printed at various times.[2] But while such documents make fairly clear the distinctive doctrinal positions of the two parties, they are not conclusive as to the particulars of the controversy. They were written largely from the point of view of partisan considerations and are therefore quite frequently contradictory.

---

[1] Bodleian MS 53, in the Bodleian Library.

It would appear that the controversy was initiated when the Freewillers, led by Henry Hart, began disseminating their views and actively soliciting converts within the prison. Under the leadership of John Bradford the more predestinarian of the reformers bestirred themselves and countered the activity of the Freewillers with equal if not greater zeal. The controversy gradually became quite bitter on both sides and eventually led to a complete severance of relations between the two parties. By Christmas of 1554 so serious had the dispute become that the two Protestant groups refused to celebrate Communion together. The Freewillers even went so far as to accuse Bradford of discriminating against them in the distribution of money collected for the prisoners of religion, of which he was the treasurer--a charge which Bradford strongly denied.[3]

---

[2] Notably, Laurence, ed., Authentic Documents Relative to the Predestinarian Controversy, Which Took Place Among Those Who Were Imprisoned for Their Adherence to the Doctrines of the Reformation by Queen Mary (Oxford: W. Baxter, 1819).

[3] John Bradford, The Writings of John Bradford, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and Prebendary of St. Paul's, ed. Aubrey Townsend (The Parker Society Publications; 2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1848, 1853), II, 180.

The prisoners apparently perceived the scandal which their disputing was likely to bring upon the Protestant cause, for they deliberately, though unsuccessfully, attempted to conceal their differences from the authorities. The Catholics initially viewed the affair with indifference, if with some degree of satisfaction. A Dr. Martin alluded to the dispute in his examination of John Careless, one of the prisoners inclined toward the predestinarian position: "I hear say that you have divers churches and faiths in the King's Bench.... I pray thee tell me what is the cause of so much contention between you....I hear say one of your matters is about predestination."[4] By 1556, however, the dispute apparently had reached the point of interfering with the discipline and order of the prison, for in that year the authorities were forced to intervene.[5]

After a time there was a movement toward reconciliation between the parties, and some compromises were made. Terms of an agreement were drawn up, and for a while it seemed as if the dispute would be settled. The talks eventually collapsed, however, and no solid agreement was ever effected. It would appear that the predestinarians were in the main responsible for the failure of the negotiations. They seem to have viewed the discussions primarily as a means toward the ultimate conversion of the Freewillers to their own views, as is evident from the following passage contained in a letter from Bradford to John Philpot:

---

[4] Included in John Foxe, _The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe_, ed. George Townsend (8 vols.; London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1843-1849), VIII, 164-66.

[5] Strype, _Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Wherein the History of the Church and the Reformation of It, During the Primacy of the Said Archbishop, Are Greatly Illustrated_ (2 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1812), I, 505.

> Go on for God's sake to seek unity in Christ....If once we come into an unity and love, then shall we not suspect one another, neither take things into the worse part. Nothing hindereth them more, than for that now they hear all that ever we speak *cum prejudicio*; where, if an unity be had, this *prejudicium* will be taken away, and so then shall they see the truth the sooner.[6]

An event which served to widen the breach between the parties was the circumstance by which Henry Hart wrote and circulated a tract entitled "The Enormities Proceeding of the Opinion, That Predestination, Calling, and Election, Is Absolute in Man as It Is in God." The short but highly controversial statement, which contained a vigorous indictment of the predestinarian position, occasioned the key work of the entire controversy, Bradford's Defense of Election, as his major work is usually designated. Indeed, it is only through Bradford's answer that Hart's tract can be reconstructed at all.[7] The tract would have to have been written at the latest before October 11, 1554, the date of Bradford's reply.

In his treatise Hart lists six "enormities" with which he feels the doctrine of predestination is associated. These include the consions that "God's justice is general over all men, but his mercy is not so"; that "the virtue of Christ's blood doth not, neither can, extend to all people"; and that "there is no sin in man, for, if man have no choice, then the evil man doth that which God would have him to do, as well as the good man." Further objections to the doctrine are that "God's power and omnipotence is thereby denied, in that it is said, that he cannot know first, predestinate, and elect all men in Christ Jesus to salvation, and also to give the choice during this life, as he hath said"; that "it putteth away the covenant between God and man, yea, partly on God's part, in that Christ is denied to be a general Saviour to all men, but wholly and altogether on man's part, for it taketh all the power and ableness, which God hath before given, from him"; and that "it colourably denieth excommunication to be had and used in the congregation of Christ, because no man can know when another is elect or not."[8] In the case of each of the enormities, Hart attempts to refute the predestinarian view and prove it to be contrary to the Scriptures.

---

[6] Bradford, *The Writings of John Bradford*, II, 243-44.

[7] Bradford included in his treatise the text of Henry Hart's tract, "not leaving out one tittle," as he observes, "of every word as he hath put it abroad." "A Treatise of Predestination with an Answer to Certain Enormities Calumniously Gathered of One to Slander God's Truth" [Hereinafter referred to as "A Treatise of Predestination"], *ibid*., I, 309.

It was John Bradford who, in what must have been the most important single work of the controversy, answered Hart's tract on the part of the predestinarian side. Bradford had risen steadily in preferment during the preceding reign and had achieved some prominence by the time of the death of Edward VI. As early as 1548 he had been reading Martin Bucer, and later had studied personally under that reformer at Cambridge. In 1550 he had been ordained deacon by Bishop Ridley, and soon thereafter had been made one of the bishop's chaplains. In 1552 he had become one of King Edward's six chaplains in ordinary. He was arrested six weeks after Mary's accession, in August, 1553; and after being imprisoned for a while with Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, he was transferred to the King's Bench. There he soon became the acknowledged leader of the predestinarian party in the developing dispute. He was burned at Smithfield as a heretic on July 1, 1555.[9]

---

[8] Quoted in Bradford, "A Treatise of Predestination," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 319-29.

Bradford's treatise, which did not see publication until 1562, as an appendage to another work, was entitled in full, "A Treatise of Predestination with an Answer to Certain Enormities Calumniously Gathered of One to Slander God's Truth."[10] Written in a rather difficult style, the work consisted of a dedication and two distinct parts. In the first part Bradford set forth his own views on predestination, while in the second he attempted to answer, item by item, the accusations put forward by Hart.

One may accurately say that the doctrine of predestination, or election, was Bradford's most distinctive theological emphasis. Besides his Defense of Election, Bradford wrote two other short treatises dealing with the doctrine. These were entitled "A Treatise of Election and Free-Will," and "A Brief Sum of the Doctrine of Election and Predestination," both being published along with the Defense in 1562.[11] In addition, there are numerous passages in Bradford's private letters, especially those addressed to the Freewillers, which deal directly with the doctrine. In order to determine exactly what Bradford's position was, some of the chief ideas found in his Defense, and confirmed or supplemented in his other writings, will now be examined.

---

[9] Arthur Henry Bullen, "John Bradford," _Dictionary of National Biography_, ed. Leslie Stephen (London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1886), VI, 157-59.

[10] Bradford, _The Writings of John Bradford_, I, 305. Actually the treatise was only partially printed in 1562, the entire text being published for the first time in 1853, by the Parker Society.

Bradford set the tone for his treatise in the very first sentence of the dedication:

> Faith of God's election (I mean, to believe that we be in very deed "the children of God" through Christ, and shall be for ever inheritors of everlasting life through the only grace of God our Father in the same Christ) is of all things which God requireth of us, not only most principal, but also the whole sum.[12]

Rather than leading to enormities, he asserts, the doctrine is full of "commodities": It "magnifies God's mercy," it "produces humility in the elect," and it "comforteth most comfortably under the cross," to mention only a few.[13] The latter commodity was, of course, particularly relevant to the prison situation.

In the first section of the treatise Bradford defines the doctrine which he would defend, i.e., "that God hath of his own mercy and good will, and 'to the praise of his glory' in Christ, elected some, and not all."[14] For Bradford the basic cause of both election and reprobation is God's pleasure and will. To the elect God shows his mercy "because it pleaseth him"; and he "hardeneth the heart of others whom he will."[15] Such unmerited favor in election is a source of never-failing wonder to Bradford:

---

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 211, 219.

[12] "A Treatise of Predestination," *ibid.*, p. 307.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 307-308.

> That I, being a miser, "born in sin, conceived in iniquity," to whom nothing is due (more than to a Turk, Jew, or Saracen,) but eternal damnation, should be called into the number of thy people, enrolled in thy book, and now in thy covenant, so that thou, with all that ever thou hast, art mine![16]

Possibly the chief point of Bradford's teaching was his special emphasis upon the certainty of election. Election is "as certain and sure as is God himself,"[17] it being literally impossible for the elect to "perish or err to damnation finally."[18] The refrain, "the Lord putting his hand under them that, if they fall, yet they shall not lie still," is employed again and again in this context.[19] Indeed, those who do fall and finally perish had "but a show of faith" to begin with; they "never truly believed."[20] But he who is chosen and in truth believes "shall be cocksure for evermore"; his election is "certain for ever, for ever, for ever--I say, for ever."[21]

---

[14] Ibid., p. 311.

[15] Ibid., p. 312.

[16] "A Meditation upon the Ten Commandments," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 150.

[17] "The Flesh and the Spirit," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 302.

[18] "A Treatise of Predestination," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 314.

[19] Letter to Certain Freewillers, The Writings of John Bradford, II, 165; cf., also, The Writings of John Bradford, I, 298, 317, and II, 113, 134.

Bradford urges, however, that godly living is of paramount importance to the elect by way of certifying his election. He speaks of "the Spirit of sanctification" as the "seal of our election."[22] "If we did certainly believe we were members of Christ and God's temples," he asks, "how should we but flee from all impurity and corruption of the world?"[23] While evil in the life of the elect may never be completely vanquished, the very existence of the inward struggles between the spirit and the flesh are "testimonials" of election.[24] And the more one is persuaded of his election, the more his life is actually transformed into the image of God.

Perhaps the most crucial aspect of Bradford's predestinarian views was his teaching with regard to reprobation. It has already been suggested that he held both election and reprobation to be based generally upon the will and pleasure of God. Along this line he states that God's glory "is set forth, as well in them that perish and are reprobates, as in the elect."[25] But it cannot therefore be concluded that his teaching was one of unconditional reprobation; for on this extremely important issue Bradford, unfortunately, is not altogether consistent. While his general affirmations seem to indicate an unconditional election as well as reprobation, the greater part of what he has to say on the subject is of a somewhat more moderate character.

---

[20] "A Treatise of Predestination," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 313, 325.

[21] Letter to Mistress Joyce Hales, The Writings of John Bradford, II, 109, 113.

[22] "A Treatise of Predestination," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 309.

[23] Letter to Mistress Wilkerson and Mistress Warcup, The Writings of John Bradford, II, 122.

[24] "The Flesh and the Spirit," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 302.

While Bradford is not at all anxious to dwell upon the negative side of predestination, he does nevertheless express his views in summary form in his short statement, "A Brief Sum of the Doctrine of Election and Predestination." What he says there is that the reprobate cannot legitimately blame God for their dammation; for, as he puts it, it is "their own willfulness, sin, and contemning of Christ, which is the cause of their reprobation."[26] "Dammation is for our sins," and "cometh of ourselves," he states elsewhere.[27] Perhaps the essence of his position is contained in his exhortation that "election is not to be looked on but in Christ, nor reprobation but in sin."[28] In the sense that God's decrees are from the beginning then, reprobation for Bradford has to be based upon God's foreknowledge of human sin.

---

[25] "A Treatise of Predestination," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 315.

[26] The Writings of John Bradford, I, 219.

[27] "A Treatise of Predestination," ibid., pp. 324, 325.

[28] "A Brief Sum of the Doctrine of Election and Predestination," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 220.

Bradford's relative moderation is further demonstrated in another somewhat related area. In more than one reference Bradford speaks of the work of Christ and the promises of the Gospel as having a universal application. "This death of Christ therefore," he writes, "look on as the very pledge of God's love towards thee whosoever thou art, how deep soever thou hast sinned."[29] Again, "I believe that Christ, for man being thus fallen, did oppose himself to the justice of God, a mediator, paying the ransom and price of redemption for Adam, and his whole posterity that refuse it not finally."[30] Finally, "As from Adam all have received sin to damnation, so by Christ all have grace offered to salvation, if they reject not the same."[31] The Gospel thus is offered freely to all; and it is man who reads his own self out of the promises by his rejection of God's universal offer.

These then are some of the principal points of Bradford's teaching. The English church historian Gordon Rupp has suggested that Bradford "is perhaps the first Calvinist among the English Reformers."[32]

---

[29] "A Sermon of Repentance," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 75.

[30] Letter to Robert Cole and Nicholas Sheterden, The Writings of John Bradford, II, 133.

[31] "A Sermon of Repentance," The Writings of John Bradford, I, 67.

[32] Rupp, "John Bradford, Martyr, Ob. 1 July, 1555," The London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLXXXVIII, No. 1 (January, 1963), 52.

But as can clearly be seen, his views differ considerably from those of Calvin, in the direction of greater moderation. It is probably more accurate in this regard to view Bradford as a continuation of that basically moderate English tradition which had its beginning with Tyndale.

What *is* sometimes extreme in Bradford, however, is his attitude toward the opposition. He can refer to Hart as "a calumnious calumniator" who "hath not learned his A B C concerning the scriptures,... ordering the cart before the horse," and can describe the work of the Freewillers as "their witless, unreasonable, arrogant, and very detestable 'hows.'"[33] Of his own work he boasts:

> By the scriptures, I say, I have briefly and sufficiently so proved the doctrine of election taught and holden by me, that doing right to God's word he cannot be able to improve [disprove] it, if he shalt take to help him herein the Jew's talmud, the Mohamet's alcoran, and the papist's decretals to help him, (for with them he plainly agreeth in this matter of election and free will.)[34]

Bradford defends the sharpness of his answers by reference to "the weightiness of the matter."[35]

In all fairness, however, it must be said that toward the end of the controversy Bradford's attitude did change considerably. In his later letters to the Freewillers a new spirit of Christian charity and forbearance was manifested. Witness the following passage from a letter to the Freewillers:

---

[33] "A Treatise of Predestination," *The Writings of John Bradford*, I, 318, 319, 330.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 329.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 309.

> I am persuaded of you, that you fear the Lord; and therefore I love you and have loved you in him, my dear hearts, though otherwise you have taken it without cause on my part given, so far as I know. Now am I going before you "to my God and your God, to my Father and your Father," to my Christ and your Christ, to my home and your home. I go before; but you shall come after, sooner or later.[36]

In another letter he concedes that "if we cannot agree in all points, either the points perchance be not so necessary, or else by love we shall hereafter be brought to see that which yet is hid."[37] And in yet another, he admirably exhorts: "Though in some things we agree not, yet let love bear the bell away; and let us one pray for another, and be careful one for another; for I hope we be all Christ's."[38]

That his Defense of Election alone would not be able to silence the Freewillers must have become apparent to Bradford by the end of 1554, for in January of the following year he felt compelled to bring the whole matter to the attention of the Protestant leaders imprisoned at Oxford. On January 18, 1555, Bradford sent an urgent appeal to Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, informing them of the controversy and soliciting their support in his behalf. Along with the letter, which was signed also by three other predestinarian leaders in the King's Bench, Robert Ferrar, Rowland Taylor, and John Philpot, Bradford sent copies of his own treatise, and of a composition by Henry Hart as well.

---

[36] _The Writings of John Bradford_, II, 197.

[37] _Ibid_., p. 215.

[38] _Ibid_., p. 180.

The primary purpose of Bradford's appeal apparently was to secure an endorsement of his own treatise by "the chief captains of Christ's Church here," as the following passage suggests:

> I send unto you a little Treatise which I have made, that you might peruse the same, and not only you, but also ye my other most dear and reverend fathers in the Lord for ever, to give to it your approbation as ye may think good. All the prisoners hereabouts in manner have seen it and read it; and as therein they agree with me, nay, rather with the truth, so they are ready and will be to signify, as they shall see you give them example.[39]

By way of evidence then of the seriousness of the matter, the writing of Hart was included:

> The matter may be thought not so necessary as I seem to make it: but yet, if ye knew the great evil that is like hereafter to come to the posterity by these men, as partly this bringer can signify unto you, surely then could ye not but be most willing to put hereto your helping hands. The which thing that I might more occasion you to perceive, I have sent you here a writing of Harry Hart's own hand, whereby ye may see how Christ's glory and grace is like to lose much light, if your sheep quondam be not something holpen by them that love God.[40]

The latter passage would seem to suggest that Bradford expected more than a mere endorsement of his own work--perhaps something from the pens of the bishops themselves. Later in the same letter Bradford, interestingly, placed the controversy on an equal level of importance with that with the Catholics:

> The effects of salvation they so mingle and confound with the cause, that if it be not seen to more hurt will come by them,

---

[39] Ibid., p. 170.

[40] Ibid.

> than ever came by the papists, inasmuch as their life commendeth them to the world more than the papists....As to the chief captains therefore of Christ's church here, I complain of it unto you; as truly I must do of you unto God in the last day, if ye will not as ye can help something...in this behalf, as ye have on the behalf of matters expugned by the papists.[41]

As far as is known Ridley was the only one of the three leaders to recognize Bradford's appeal, and even his response was something short of enthusiastic. Almost immediately upon receiving Bradford's letter, Ridley, on January 19, wrote as follows to Augustine Bernhere, Latimer's Swiss servant who had brought Bradford's appeal:

> I have overran all that ye send, and do send you all again, that the rest may do the same: but your and his request I cannot for divers causes satisfy; for...I suppose many harms may fall thereupon if anything be [set] forth under the title and name of any prisoner, not to himself only, but to all the rest...I will be glad to hear and know what my lord of Canterbury and your master [Latimer] will say; and [I] shall also think of the matter to do the best that shall lie in me.[42]

In the same letter he went on to add that "if the matter be not more for other, than for Harry Hart's scribbling, I would think a man might be better occupied otherwise than in confuting of them."[43]

Ridley's hesitation was confirmed in his answer to Bradford himself, penned shortly thereafter, where he wrote as follows:

> I have seen what he [Bernhere] brought from you, and shortly surveyed the whole, but in such celerity, that others also might see the same before Austin's return, so that I noted nothing but a confused sum of the matter; and as yet what the

---

[41] Ibid., pp. 170, 171.

[42] Included in ibid., p. 172.

[43] Ibid., pp. 172-73.

> rest have done I can tell nothing at all, and it was at the writing hereof in their hands. To your request, and Austin's earnest demand of the same, I have answered him [probably Hart] in a brief letter; and yet he hath replied again: but he must go without any further answer of me for this time. I have told Augustine, that I for my part, as I can and may for my tardity and dullness, will think of the matter.... Austin's persuasions may do more with me in that I can think I may do conveniently in this matter, armed with your earnest and zealous letter, than any rhetorick either of Tully or Demosthenes, I ensure you thereof.[44]

From this letter it would appear that Ridley went so far as to write Hart concerning his composition, but was still somewhat reluctant in initiating anything on a wider scale.

Unfortunately, Bradford's answer to Ridley's reply has not survived. But from a subsequent letter from Ridley to Bradford, around the middle of April, it becomes obvious that Bradford was less than pleased with the response he had received from Oxford. In the following passage Ridley raises, actually for the second time, the question of the importance of the issue, and then goes on to imply that he has, as a matter of fact, undertaken some sort of treatment of the subject:

> As for other the devil's caltrops, that he casteth in our ways by some of his busy-headed Younkers, I trust, they shall never be able to do the multitude so great harm. For, blessed be God! these heresies before time, when Satan by his servants hath been about to broach them, have by God's servants already been so sharply and truly confounded, that the multitude was never infected with them; or else, when they have been infected, they are healed again, that now the peril is not so great. And--where you say that, if your request had been heard, things, you think, had been in better case than they be--know you that, concerning the matter you mean, I have in Latin drawn out the places of the scriptures, and upon the

---

[44] _Ibid_., p. 174.

> same have noted what I can for the time. Sir, in those matters I am so fearful, that I dare not speak further, yea, almost none otherwise than the very text doth, as it were, lead me by the hand.[45]

Actually there is no internal proof that Ridley was referring to predestination in the above passage. Indeed, Archbishop Laurence strongly doubts that he was,[46] discounting the evidence of Myles Coverdale, who, in a marginal note appended to the text in his collection of the letters of the Marian martyrs wrote, "He meaneth here the matter of God's election, whereof he afterward wrote a godly and comfortable treatise remaining yet in the hands of some, and hereafter shall come to light, if God so will."[47] It would seem logical, however, especially in view of the context of the Bradford-Ridley correspondence as a whole, that that is what he had in mind.

There is one additional bit of evidence, to which apparently neither Coverdale nor Laurence had access. In a later undated letter from Ridley to Bradford, what must have been an enlarged and revised version of Ridley's original work was mentioned:

> That I have so long been silent toward you, has been caused by the rather arduous labour of this my offspring which I now send you. And, although I have been a long time in travail,

---

[45] _Ibid_., p. 214.

[46] Laurence, ed., _Authentic Documents Relative to the Predestinarian Controversy_, p. xxxvi.

[47] Myles Coverdale, ed., _Certain Most Godly, Fruitful, and Comfortable Letters of Such True Saintes and Holy Martyrs of God, as in the Late Bloodye Persecution Here Within This Realme, Gave Their Lyves for the Defence of Christes Holy Gospel; Written in the Tyme of Theyr Affliction and Cruell Imprisonment_ (London: John Day, 1564), p. 65.

> I nevertheless bring forth now, I acknowledge, a very rude thing, and shapeless, and needing much polish. Yet, because I know you to be certainly not a despiser of my labours...I have resolved to send it to you, whatever it is and such as it may be...Yet I shall not now send all the things which I have purposed to append to this Treatise: but, because all the passages of scripture, with which I have determined to strengthen this my Treatise, as with a wall and rempart, are not yet added, I have brought together [what I could] according to the best of my judgment. After I have completed it, I shall then read again what you have previously written, and will return you your book....You will find the index of our treatise appended to the end, fol. 47: and from its perusal you will easily see the principal point of the whole treatise, and of all the matters that are handled in it.[48]

It would seem to be the case then that Ridley did write some sort of treatise on predestination, partly or entirely in response to Bradford's prodding. Unfortunately, however, his work has not survived. As to its probable character, one can, of course, only speculate. Nowhere in his correspondence with Bradford did Ridley mention concurring with the sentiments expressed in the Defense of Election; indeed, he apparently chose to draw up his own separate statement instead. On the other hand, he was quite willing to send his unfinished treatise to Bradford for his reading and judgement. Apart from the fact that it can be assumed that he was in basic agreement with the position of the seventeenth of the Forty-Two Articles, perhaps the only other clue to his approach is his own statement, already cited, that "in those matters I am so fearful, that I dare not speak further, yea, almost none otherwise than the very text doth, as it were, lead me by the hand."[49]

---

[48] Included in Bradford, The Writings of John Bradford, II, 220.

Bradford's appeal to Oxford then may be said to have been only partially successful. As far as can be determined, neither Cranmer nor Latiner, the other two leaders, responded to the initial call for help. And even Ridley's response, as has been seen, tended to be a rather cautious and moderating one. Perhaps it is reasonable to assume that the Oxford bishops were preoccupied with other more pressing matters; but one gets the distinct impression that while there may not have been any basic differences as to the doctrine, perhaps the Protestant leadership was not wholly sympathetic with Bradford's warmth on the subject. It is conceivable (and probable) that from their point of view Bradford had overrated both the importance of the controversy and the influence of his adversaries.

Support for the predestinarian cause, however, was forthcoming from a number of other sources. Augustine Bernhere, Latimer's Swiss attendant and later in the reign of Elizabeth rector of Southam,[50] put forward a short treatment of the doctrine which, while it most certainly lacked the authority of Bradford's work, nevertheless represented an important additional exposition of the predestinarian position. Obviously directed against the Freewillers in the prison controversy, the treatise, entitled "An Answere to Certein Questions Propounded of Them That Impugn and Deny God's Election," was all the more significant in that it came as close as any in the period to the Calvinist position. The following passages illustrate something of the tone of the work:

---

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

[50] Augustine Bernhere remained free during the Marian period--perhaps due to his foreign nationality--but he was in constant contact with the Protestant prisoners. William Hunt, "Augustine Bernher," *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Leslie Stephen (London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1885), IV, 392. *Cf.* also, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, XXIII (1950), 97.

> God of his infinite mercy hath determined and purposed before the foundation of the world was laid to take some out of the lost seed of Adam and to regenerate them and make them heirs of his kingdom and vessels of his glory, to set forth in them his profound mercy and goodness; and also he hath prepared the rest to be vessels of his wrath, in whom he is determined to shew and set forth his righteous judgments and justice rewarding them according to their deeds with everlasting punishments, whereby he bringeth to pass that the wicked may feel his hatred against sin, and also the godly may the more see the exceeding goodness of their heavenly father towards them.[51]
>
> It sufficeth the children of God to be assured in their heart by the operation of the Holy Ghost that they themselves be chosen to eternal life before the world was made, and in that God doth give them faith and true repentance and all manner of spiritual gifts they praise him for it and confirm their election by it. That is to say, they learn to know and by the operation of the Holy Ghost they are assured that by the immutable counsel of God they are chosen to eternal life; as for the reprobate, they will not dispute with God why he did not ordain them also to life, but rather do worship and reverence his divine Majesty and unspeakable power and wisdom, by the which he is able to set forth his own glory and renown even in the very reprobate, which shall be dammed for evermore because of their own wickedness, God himself being just and holy in all his works, and not the author or cause of any evil.[52]

Elsewhere, in his reply to a letter from John Laurence and John Barre, Bernhere writes, closely paralleling Calvin: "God would have Adam to fall because he thought it so good. Why he thought it so good is unknown to us. Adam did fall, the providence of God so appointing the same....If you grant an election before the beginning of the world you must needs grant likewise a reprobation, for they be correlatives, so that there could be no election except there be also reprobation."[53] What is most remarkable is that Bernhere should claim as being on his side in this regard "my dear master Latimer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Ridley and Mr. Bradford, Philpott, Careless, and the rest of the saints of God!"[54]

---

[51] Bodleian MS 53, fols. 108b-109a.

[52] *Ibid.*, fols. 109b-110a.

John Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, likewise took an active part in the controversy on the side of the predestinarians. As has already been noted, he was one of the co-signers of Bradford's appeal to the Oxford bishops. He became a martyr to the Protestant cause on December 18, 1555, when he was burned at Smithfield.

Even more so than Bernhere, Philpot is associated with the doctrines and works of Calvin. He is known to have translated into English and published an edition of Calvin's homilies, which unfortunately is no longer extant.[55] When asked his opinion of the Genevan Church during his examinations by the Catholics, he answered: "I allow the church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same; for it is _una catholica_, _et_ _apostolica_, and doth follow the doctrine that the apostles did preach; and the doctrine taught and preached in king Edward's days was also according to the same."[56] When further pressed, he taunted his examiners by asking, "Which of you all at this day is able to answer Calvin's Institutions, who is minister of Geneva?" He then added, "For in the matter of predestination he is in none other opinion than all the doctors of the church be, agreeing to the scriptures."[57]

---

[53] _Ibid_., fol. 144a.

[54] _Ibid_., fol. 146a.

[55] William Arthur Jobson Archbold, "John Philpot," _Dictionary of National Biography_, ed. Sidney Lee (London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1896), XLV, 226.

While the details of Philpot's views of predestination are for the most part unknown, certainly in temperament and disposition toward opponents, even more so than the early Bradford, he is in the Calvinist tradition. Witness the following passages from his Apology for Spitting upon an Arian, directed against the Freewillers:

> I never saw, neither heard before of, such a sight of giddy and fantastical heads, who delight only in singularity; whom I do much pity, because they take so much pains to go to the devil.... And if perchance any of them be soberer than other, their answer is, "I pray you let us alone; our conscience is satisfied; you labour but in vain to go about to turn us."...Proud they are, and puffed up in the imaginations of their own hearts and blind senses, and judge themselves best of all other, because they can make a pale face of hypocrisy to the world, and cast a glass of dissembling water before the eyes of the simple people....Might not these hypocrites be ashamed of their brideless blasphemous tongues, if the devil had not rubbed away all shame from their foreheads....O what a many of vain caterpillars be there, which corrupt the sweet and wholesome flowers of the gospel to the shame thereof as much as it lieth in them! It had been better for them never to have known

---

[56] John Philpot, The Examinations and Writings of John Philpot, B.C.L., Archdeacon of Winchester, Martyr, 1555, ed. Robert Eden (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The University of Cambridge Press, 1842), p. 153.

[57] Ibid., p. 46.

> the gospel than by their proud free-will knowledge to go about to subvert the same.[58]

In yet another passage Philpot reveals something of his understanding of the meaning of the prison controversy: "If you hear that there is contention between us and them that be in prison, marvel not therefore, neither let your minds be alienated from the truth anything thereby; for, as it is written, 'It is necessary that heresies should be, that the elect might be tried.'"[59] Finally, in a letter sent to his congregation from prison in 1555, Philpot, in words not dissimilar to those of the late Edwardian doctrinal standards, warns against some of the abuses of the doctrine, and the dangers inherent therein:

> Some other there be, that for an extreme refuge in their evil doings, do run to God's predestination and election, saying, that if I be elected of God to salvation, I shall be saved whatsoever I do. But such be great tempters of God, and abominable blasphemers of God's holy election;...Such verily may reckon themselves to be none of God's elect children, that will do evil that good may ensue; whose damnation is just, as St. Paul saith. God's predestination and election ought to be with a simple eye considered, to make us more warily to walk in good and godly conversation according to God's word, and not to set cock in the hoop, and put all on God's back, to do wickedly at large.[60]

John Careless also seems to have played something more than a merely passive role in the prison dispute. He was a weaver by profession, from Coventry, and died in the King's Bench on July 1, 1556. Shortly before his death he apparently composed and circulated a strongly predestinarian confession of his faith. Although the document has not survived, it is known to have been endorsed with counter-confessions by the Freewillers Hart, Gibson, and Chamberlain.[61]

---

[58] _Ibid_., pp. 305, 306, 307, 308.

[59] _Ibid_., p. 305.

[60] _Ibid_., pp. 223-24.

Beyond this, Careless, at several points in his "First Examination," made allusions to the controversy. In this connection he outlines his belief in predestination in the following terms: "That Almighty God, our most dear loving Father, of his great mercy and infinite goodness, through Jesus Christ, did elect and appoint in him before the foundation of the earth was laid, a church or congregation, which he doth continually guide and govern by his grace and Holy Spirit, so that not one of them shall ever finally perish."[62] As for reprobation, however, Careless will say nothing: "I say with St. Paul, I have nothing to do with them that are without. I will leave them to God, whose judgments are just. My whole desire is to feel the depth of God's mercy towards his elect."[63] "I will maintain nothing further," he says in an earlier passage, "than I have the word of God as my warrant."[64] Indicative of his commitment to the doctrine is the following passage from one of his letters from prison: "And now, as concerning the most comfortable doctrine of our eternal election in him, before the foundation of the world was laid: I do protest before God and man, that if every hair of my head were a man's life, I would willingly give them all in the defense thereof."[65]

---

[61] Foxe, The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, VIII, 164; and Strype, Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, I, 505.

[62] Included in Foxe, The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, VIII, 168.

[63] Ibid., p. 166.

[64] Ibid., p. 164.

Finally, there are two private confessions of faith which have come out of the prison situation and which make mention of predestination. While it is unlikely that they were directly connected with the prison controversy as such, they are significant nevertheless in that they provide some evidence that the doctrine was perhaps penetrating the realm of popular theology as well.

The first of these is by John Clement and is entitled "A Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith." Although a layman (a wheelwright by occupation), Clement was imprisoned for his religion, and escaped burning at the hands of the Catholics only by his death in the King's Bench in 1556.

Of Clement's twenty articles, the last two dealt with predestination or related issues. The nineteenth set forth his views on original sin and the bondage of the will; the twentieth, on predestination as such. "I do perceive," he writes in preface to the twentieth article, "that not only Papists, but also divers other that be professors of God's word...do, with words and writings, impugn the most pure, heavenly, sweet, comfortable, and true doctrine of God's firm predestination and free election."[66] For this reason he feels compelled to declare a brief summary of his own faith in that regard.

---

[65] _Certain Most Godly, Fruitful, and Comfortable Letters_, p. 575.

[66] Included in Strype, _Ecclesiastical Memorials_, III, ii, 461.

For Clement, it is only of God's "abundant mercy, and free goodness, and favor in Jesus Christ" that men are saved. On this basis God has "ordained, predestinated, elected, and appointed (before that the foundation of the world was laid) an inumerable multitude of Adam's posterity to be saved from their sins."[67] So sure is the salvation of these that "none can ever be able to pluck us forth of his hands....Not one of all God's elect children shall finally perish or be damned."[68]

The doctrine, therfore, is "a most true, godly, necessary, wholesome, and comfortable" one. But Christians should "be ware in any wise of curiosity." Rather they should "reverence and worship the deep secrets and judgements of God...for he is holy in all his works and righteous in all his ways."[69]

As for the other side of the doctrine, Clement, like Careless, had little to say: "As for reprobation, I have nothing to say of it; for Saint Paul saith, 'What have we to do with them that are without.'"[70]

The second confession is one agreed to and issued by thirteen Protestant prisoners just before they were burned together at Stratford le Bow. All but one were from Essex, there being one Dutchman among them. In the eighth and last of their articles, the second paragraph of the seventeenth of the Forty-Two Articles was inserted complete and without alteration.[71] This is one of the clearest and most important indications of the influence of the Edwardian standards in this period.

---

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid., pp. 461, 462.

[69] Ibid., p. 463.

[70] Ibid.

As for the Freewillers, they themselves were not altogether without apologists. Hart's "Enormities," one of the earliest statements emanating from the group, has already been mentioned. But even more important was the somewhat later work of another leader, one John Trewe, who toward the end of the controversy would appear to have superseded Hart as the chief spokesman of the group. Dated January 30, 1555, and written in the form of an apology or a defense of his party's role in the controversy, Trewe's treatise was entitled "The Cause of Contention in the King's Bench, as Concerning Sects in Religion." The composition was clearly the most elaborate to be put forward by the Freewillers, and along with Bradford's Defense would appear to have been one of the more significant documents of the entire controversy.[72]

Trewe's tract is especially important in that it contained a brief narrative of the origin and progress of the dispute. Written from the point of view of the Freewillers, the account naturally placed the blame for the controversy on the predestinarian party. Trewe implies that upon numerous occasions a truce was agreed upon, only to be broken by the slanderous writings of Bradford and his associates. He further repeats many of the Freewill accusations against the predestinarians, charging them with quite un-Christian-like conduct. When the Freewillers indicted their opponents for playing at bowls, dice, and cards, a minor issue in the controversy, according to Trewe the predestinarians "did not only fall out with us, and after their accustomed manner call and report us heretics, cast dust in our faces, and give judgment of damnation on us, and otherwise ungodly handle us; but also threatened us, that we were like to die for it if the Gospel should reign again!"[73]

---

[71] Cf., Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, III, ii, 471.

[72] Laurence has included John Trewe's entire treatise in his Authentic Documents Relative to the Predestinarian Controversy, pp. 37-70.

Beyond this Trewe moves into a discussion of what he considers to be the basic issues of the controversy. And while he quite consistently misrepresents the views of his opponents, the discussion is valuable nevertheless for outlining the Freewill position on some of the key points in dispute.

On the issue of the final perseverance of the elect, Trewe characterizes the predestinarian position as being one which asserts that "if the Elect did commit never so great offense or sin, they should not finally perish." Such a position, he maintains, tends to "make "St. Paul a liar," "destroy the fear of God" in man, and "put out of credit and unplace all those pithy places, and sentences in the holy

---

[73] Authentic Documents Relative to the Predestinarian Controversy, pp. 56-57.

Scriptures, that at these troublesome days doth cause men to forsake evil."[74]

On the issue of reprobation and the cause of sin in man, the predestinarian position is represented as being one which maintains that all who were "not predestinate to be the heirs of the kingdom of heaven before the foundation of the world was laid, were ordained and reprobated to do wickedly and to be damned," God having "made them for this evil purpose" and there being "no means in them to avoid it." Such a view, Trewe asserts, suggests partiality on the part of God. Furthermore, it makes God the "author of all sin and abomination that is done and committed on the earth, clean discharging the devil and man thereof." It tends to make God "a mocker, a vain person, and a fool."[75]

On the issue of the extent of the Atonement, the predestinarians are said to affirm "that Christ hath not died for all men." Such a doctrine, Trewe declares, cannot but drive men to despair, not knowing whether Christ died for them. It further tends to destroy all certainty of salvation. On the other hand, the view that Christ died for all men satisfies "every man that doth repent and unfeignedly believe with a lively faith [that he] is in the state of salvation, and one of God's elect children."[76]

---

[74] Ibid., p. 39.

[75] Ibid., pp. 41, 42, 44.

[76] Ibid., pp. 45, 46.

Trewe then proceeds to enumerate, "again," the "many detestable enormities and great absurdities" of the predestinarian position. But these are not, as one might immediately suspect, the same as those put forward by Hart. Rather Trewe's list is much more extensive, and includes twenty-three different "enormities."

In this connection Trewe suggests that the doctrine implies that there is evil in God, in that it affirms that the reprobates were ordained and created only to do evil; that it defaces the dignity, efficacy, and virtue of Christ's Passion, in affirming that Christ died not for all men; that it makes grace inferior to sin, in that Adam's influence is held to be more extensive than that of Christ; and that it causes many to live carelessly, in that it teaches that all men were either "elected or reprobated before the foundations of the world were laid, and if they be in, they cannot fall, and if they be out, their weeping cannot help."[77] He further maintains that it destroys the fear of God, in affirming that none of the elect can finally perish regardless of their sins; that it compromises the sharp threatenings of the Scriptures and makes almost the whole of the Bible to be non-effective, in that the scriptural exhortations to repent are made to be meaningless if the elect cannot as a matter of fact fall; and that it encourages neglect of the Bible, as with the Papists, in affirming that simple men cannot understand its truths.[78]

---

[77] Ibid., pp. 48-50.

[78] Ibid., pp. 52-54.

Finally, Trewe concludes his treatise with a set of articles, seven in number, which he, in conjunction with some other of the Freewillers, drew up and signed toward the end of the controversy. The move was supposedly one of conciliation on the part of the Freewillers; however, the predestinarian party would have no part of the articles. The articles themselves were quite general in nature, although they did touch on predestination and related issues in a few places. Perhaps the strongest statement in this regard was the assertion that Christ's body "offered to the death once on the cross for all" is "a sure and perfect sacrifice and sufficient ransom for all the sins of Adam, and for all and singular of his posterity's sins, how great and many soever they be," and that all who "truly repent, unfeignedly believe with a lively faith, and persevere therein to the end of this mortal life, shall be saved," there being "no decree of God to the contrary."[79]

What then can be said about this prison controversy? Upon first examination, of course, it would seem quite surprising to say the least that a dispute such as this should have arisen among men in these particular circumstances. One would think that the Protestants might more profitably have waived the issue and reserved their strength for the defense of the more momentous and pressing objects then being placed in jeopardy. Most of the participants eventually suffered martyrdom at the stake, and under those conditions there could, of course, be no victor, although both parties claimed numerous converts to their respective causes.[80]

---

[79] Ibid., p. 66.

And yet on a more profound level, perhaps it was not unnatural at all that the issue should have arisen as it did. With the "ungodly" in power and the "righteous remnant" in prison, perhaps it was inevitable that thoughts should turn to themes of inscrutable election. In this particular context predestination may well have functioned as a theology of the jail-house.

Beyond this it can be said that the controversy had the effect, at least momentarily, of placing the doctrine of predestination squarely in the center of English Protestant theology, a position which it had not heretofore occupied. And in that sense it helped to set the stage for the somewhat more crucial disputes which were to develop later, in the Elizabethan period.

Nor should the essentially moderate character of the doctrine set forth, even by the more extreme representatives of the predestinarian party, be overlooked. There were of course, as has already been pointed out, some tendencies in the direction of the Calvinist position, especially in the work of Bernhere and Philpot. But even there, only approximations to the Calvinist doctrine were involved. And one would have to judge that Bradford, who after all set the basic tone for the predestinarian group, lay clearly within the moderate tradition established by the Henrician and Edwardian writers.

---

[80] Perhaps the most celebrated case was that of the Freewiller who, having been converted to predestinarian views, directed a lengthy epistle to his former associates gently but urgently suggesting that they follow his example. He reveals the circumstances of his own conversion when he writes, "For I myself could not understand S. Paul and S. James, to make them agree together, till our good preachers, which were my prison fellows, did open them unto me. I praise God for them most humbly." Included in Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, III, ii, 328. *Cf.*, *supra*, p. 54.

And finally, the fact that the Edwardian doctrinal standards did not play a more prominent role in the controversy is quite interesting, and perhaps significant. Except for an occasional passing reference they did not figure in the dispute at all, neither party appealing directly to their authority. This is rather difficult to understand in the light of their apparent relevance, unless their authority at this point was, as a matter of fact, somewhat less established than has been supposed and assumed.

## The Development of the Doctrine Among the Exiles for Religion

While most of the leading English Protestants chose to remain in England under Mary, a not inconsiderable number exercised the alternate option and took refuge across the channel on the continent. This group consisted of laymen as well as clerics, and included a number of persons who had held prominent ecclesiastical positions under Edward VI. Christina Hallowell Garrett, in a definitive study of the group, has described the movement as a "migration" rather than a flight, and has suggested that it was part of an elaborately conceived plan designed to ensure the survival of English Protestantism.[81] Be that as it may, the net result was the exodus during the first months of Mary's reign of some eight hundred English Protestants from the British Isles.

Once abroad, the paths of the exiles tended to diverge, although most of them eventually settled in the various centers of the continental Reformation. Due to differences of view on the subject of the Eucharist, the Lutheran leaders were generally rather hesitant in granting asylum; consequently, for the most part the English settled in the various centers of the Reformed tradition. Basel, Zurich, Geneva, Aarau, Emden, Strasburg, and Frankfort became for them the chief cities of refuge.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the tendency of English Protestantism to move in the direction of the Reformed tradition and away from Lutheran influences--a tendency clearly evident in the reign of Edward VI--was significantly strengthened by the exile movement. Most of the English exiles came under the direct influence of the various Reformed theologians, John Calvin, Theodore de Beza, Peter Martyr Vermigli (who had returned to the continent with the exiles), and Heinrich Bullinger being the authorities to whom they most generally turned. And while the exile itself was to last only a relatively short time, in their influence upon the later history of the English Church these contacts were to be rather momentous and far reaching.

---

[81] Christina Hallowell Garrett, The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1938), pp. 1-29.

For the purpose of this study the most important aspect of the period is the evidence that even in exile the doctrine of predestination continued to be an issue of some importance among the English Protestants. A number of treatises, translations, and other references establish it as one of the major theological concerns of the group. And it is highly significant, though not altogether surprising, that in this regard the exiles at Geneva should have taken the lead.

There are, however, a couple of minor references outside of Geneva which in point of time predate the major developments in that city. As early as 1554 a short but highly important confession of faith was published under the rather verbose title, *The Humble and Unfained Confession of the Belefe of Certain Poore Banished Men, Grounded upon the Holy Scriptures of God, and upon the Articles of That Undefiled and Onlye Undoubted True Christian Faith, Which the Holy Catholicke (That Is To Say Universal) Churches of Christ Professeth*. The confession was issued anonymously; but on stylistic and other grounds Garrett has assigned the major share in its composition to John Ponet, the ex-bishop of Winchester, with the possible collaboration of Thomas Becon and Thomas Sampson.[82] The document was addressed to the Lords and Commons of England and was apparently intended both as a protest against the reconciliation with Rome and as an indication that the exiles had remained faithful to the doctrines which had prevailed in the time of Edward VI.

---

[82] *Ibid.*, pp. 29, 54, 254. Elsewhere Garrett refers to the confession as "one of the most important documents emanating from the Marian exiles abroad." Garrett, "John Ponet and the Confession of the Banished Ministers," *Church Quarterly Review*, CXXXVII, No. 273 (October, 1943), 47. For an exception to Garrett's views, however, *cf.*, Winthrop S. Hudson, *John Ponet (1516?-1556), Advocate of Limited Monarchy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), pp. 78-79.

While the confession contained no separate section dealing specifically with predestination, the doctrine was touched upon in the section on the Church. There the elect are identified with the members of Christ's true Church:

> Of this Church are they whom the Apostle calleth Citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God: Which being built together upon the same foundation that the Prophets and Apostles were builded upon, are made an habitation of God in the spirit. This Church and Congregation is the Communion of Saints, the heavenly fellowship, and blessed company of all God's elect and chosen children, and ever were from the beginning of the world, be now, and shall be hereafter: even all true worshippers that serve him in the spirit, and in the verity, in such holiness and righteousness as is allowed in his sight.[83]

Beyond this a clear doctrine of the perseverance of the elect is asserted:

> These are the Lord's own sheep, which knowing whom their shepherd, this voice, follow not a stranger....It is the Lord's only voice that they harken unto, and him they follow, who knoweth them and giveth them eternal life: so that they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of his hand. The father of heaven, who hath given this holy flock and Congregation unto Christ his son, is greater than all, and

---

[83] [John Ponet?], The Humble and Unfained Confession of the Belefe of Certain Poore Banished Men, Grounded upon the Holy Scriptures of God, and upon the Articles of That Undefiled and Onlye Undoubted True Christian Faith, Which the Holy Catholicke (That Is To Say Universal) Churche of Christ Professeth (Wittonburge [Antwerp?]: Nicholas Dorcaster, 1554), [p. 12].

> no man is able to pluck them out of his heavenly father's hand.[84]

Apart from this a letter from two Englishmen, Robert Horn and Richard Chambers, to Heinrich Bullinger, dated September 19, 1556, suggests that there may have arisen differences concerning the doctrine among the exiles in the city of Frankfort. Witness the following passage:

> Nor are there every day wanting those, who, desirous of novelty, by their novel errors impugn the truth. It is indeed wonderful with how much loquacity, with what proud bombastic philosophy, certainly not "scientific demonstrations" (as he calls them), but with the swelling blasts of Pelagius, and vain conceits of human wisdom, a certain Justus Velsius has filled the schools, conceded to us by the kindness of the magistracy who preside over this state, with doctrines opposed to the eternal predestination of God. We send you his conceits: his blasphemies against God, his railings and invectives against master Calvin, (and indeed they are quite severe enough), we would rather omit mention of than defile our paper with such foul abuse.[85]

Of this Justus Velsius little of significance is known. Strype refers to him as "a learned man, but hot-headed, and enthusiastical," and indicates that he was a Dutchman, instead of an Englishman.[86] He apparently is the same Velsius who in 1563 showed up in London and became engaged in a dispute there over the doctrine of regeneration.[87]

---

[84] *Ibid.*, [p. 17].

[85] *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation*, p. 132.

[86] Strype, *The History of the Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund Grindal, the First Bishop of London, and the Second Archbishop of York and Canterbury Successively, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821), p. 135.

[87] *Ibid.*

As has already been indicated, however, it was among the exiles at Geneva that the major developments in this regard took place. The English congregation there had been organized in 1555, as a direct result of the withdrawal from Frankfort of a group of Englishmen under the leadership of the Scottish reformer John Knox. The group had been forced out of Frankfort due to differences with the majority there over the structure of the liturgy, and had accepted the hospitality offered them by the Genevan authorities. By November, 1555, a church had been established, and in the same month two English exile leaders, Anthony Gilby and Christopher Goodman, were elected the first ministers.[88]

The activities of this group form one of the most interesting as well as significant chapters in the history of English Protestantism. Within a year they had drawn up their own book of worship and form of church discipline. Beyond this they produced numerous works of a theological and ecclesiastical nature. Topping all, of course, was their monumental translation of the Bible into English. And it is worthy of notice, though hardly surprising, that in all of these endeavors quite free use was made of the rather abundant resources which the city of their adoption provided.

---

[88] Concerning the English exiles at Geneva, *cf*., Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais Réfugiés à Genève au Temps de Calvin, 1550-1560* (Genève: Librarie A. Jullien, 1915); Samuel James Knox, "John Knox's Genevan Congregation," *The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England*, XI, No. 1 (May, 1956), 3-18; and Henry J. Cowell, "The Sixteenth-century English-speaking Refugee Churches at Geneva and Frankfort," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, XVI, No. 2 (1939), 209-30.

It is highly significant that in many of these works predestination played an important if not altogether dominant role. There are numerous references to the doctrine and related topics in both the service book and the translation of the Bible; and in addition it was the exclusive subject of at least three separate treatises published by the group. And if in the previous development of the doctrine the authority of the reformer of Geneva had been held to a minimum, it now ran rampant. In most of these works the influence of John Calvin's theology is not only unmistakable, but quite clearly determinative as well. This is particularly the case with the later treatises, where the debt to Calvinist sources is openly acknowledged; but even apart from these the imprint of his works is not hard to detect.

In 1556 the service book of the Genevan exiles appeared under the title, _The Forme of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, Etc., Used in the Englishe Congregation at Geneva_. Following upon the preface there was included a brief confession of faith, which provides the earliest indication of the preoccupation of the group with the doctrine of predestination. Placed under the title, "The Confession of Our Faith, Which Are Assembled in the Englishe Congregation at Geneva," the document was issued anonymously, although it is believed to have been primarily the work of John Knox. In the section dealing with the Church there was included a brief but interesting passage which is rather remarkable for its assertion not only of election, but of reprobation as well:

> I believe therefore and confess one holy Church, which (as members of Jesus Christ, the only head thereof) consent in faith, hope, and charity, using the gifts of God, whether they be temporal or spiritual, to the profit and furtherance of the same. Which Church is not seen to man's eye, but only known to God, who of the lost sons of Adam, hath ordained some, as vessels of wrath, to damnation, and hath chosen others, as vessels of his mercy, to be saved; the which also, in due time, he calleth to integrity of life and godly conversation, to make them a glorious church to himself.[89]

The marks of the Calvinist doctrine are quite clearly evident in the passage.

Perhaps the most enduring contribution of the exile community was their translation of the Bible into English. The New Testament appeared in Geneva in 1557, with an introductory epistle written by Calvin. Three years later the entire Bible was published, a number of the exiles having stayed on in Geneva after Mary's death in order to complete the work.

While the names of the translators were not mentioned, William Whittingham, one of the chief leaders of the group, almost certainly bore the primary burden of the work. The New Testament of 1557 is generally believed to have been solely his work, and he doubtlessly took the lead in the other as well. He did receive substantial help in the later work, however, Anthony Gilby, Thomas Sampson, William Cole, Christopher Goodman, William Kethe, and John Baron being the names most frequently mentioned in that regard.[90]

---

[89] John Knox, _The Works of John Knox_, ed. David Laing (5 vols.; Edinburgh: The Wodrow Society and the Banatyne Club, 1846-1864), IV, 172-73.

Not the least important part of the work were the extensive marginal notes and summaries which the editors appended to the translation. Predominately doctrinal in character, the notes were in large measure derived from the French Bible which Calvin had just revised and published in 1558.[91] Distinctively Calvinistic in tone, a significant number of the notes touched upon the doctrine of predestination, as the following extracts will show.

> God, in His election and reprobation, doth not only appoint the ends, but the means tending to the same. [Deuteronomy ii, 30.]
>
> The wicked, when they hear God's judgements, tremble and despair, but cannot seek for mercy by repentance. [I Samuel xxviii, 20.]
>
> God suffereth his word to be declared to the wicked, because of the godly that are among them. [II Kings iii, 14.]
>
> [God's] just judgement...appointed the reprobate to eternal damnation. [Psalms cxlvii, 20.]
>
> As the only will and purpose of God is the chief cause of election and reprobation: so his free mercy in Christ is an inferior cause of salvation, and the hardening of the heart an inferior cause of damnation. [Romans ix, 15.][92]

---

[90] Martin, Les Protestants Anglais Réfugiés à Genève au Temps de Calvin, p. 241; Cowell, "The Sixteenth-century English-speaking Refugee Churches at Geneva and Frankfort," Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London, XVI, No. 2 (1939), 216; and S. J. Knox, "John Knox's Genevan Congregation," The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England, XI, No. 1 (May, 1956), 13.

[91] Stanley Lawrence Greenslade, "English Versions of the Bible, 1525-1611," The Cambridge History of the Bible; the West from the Reformation to the Present Day, ed. Greenslade (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 168.

[92] The Bible and Holy Scripture Conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament, Translated According to the Ebrue and Greke, and Conferred with the Best Translations in Divers Languages, with Moste Profitable Annotations upon All the Hard Places [Geneva Version] (Geneva: Rouland Hall, 1560).

It would, of course, be pointless to multiply quotations. But annotations such as these were all the more important in light of the immense influence which in subsequent years the Geneva Bible came to exert over English religion. Although it was never sanctioned for official use in churches, it quite clearly was the most popular version throughout the Elizabethan and on into the Jacobean period. It not only superseded the Great Bible, but also retained its popularity against the Bishop's Bible, and, at least for a generation, against the Authorized Version as well. No less than 140 editions of the version saw publication through 1644.[93]

Beyond these community projects, there is considerable evidence that the Genevan exiles were preoccupied with the doctrine on an individual basis as well. William Whittingham, Anthony Gilby, and John Knox each produced and published at Geneva separate treatments of predestination, the three, however, being apparently not altogether unrelated.

In the case of Whittingham, an accomplished linguist, the contribution was a translation rather than an original work. In 1556 he published a translation of one of the more important treatises on predestination of Theodore de Beza, the close associate and successor of Calvin at Geneva. The translation was put forward under the title, A

---

[93] Greenslade, "English Versions of the Bible, 1525-1611," The Cambridge History of the Bible, p. 159. Nor was the Calvinistic tone of the work weakened in subsequent editions. Rather, to the contrary, it became increasingly more pronounced. *Cf.*, *infra*, pp. 197-200.

*Brief Declaration of the Chief Points of Christian Religion, Set Forth in a Table of Predestination*; and although the first edition of the work is no longer extant, a later one, published at London without date (but probably in 1575), has survived.[94]

The translation was apparently put forward without benefit of either preface or introduction, as the second edition, probably a reimpression of the first, bore neither of these. Little beyond conjecture, therefore, can be said about the purpose or intent of the work. Indeed, it is only from a later translation of the same work that Whittingham can be confirmed as the original translator.

In 1576 John Stockwood, a Puritan divine and the translator of a number of the works of the continental theologians, published at London a completely new English translation of Beza's treatise. Apparently ignorant of the first, he explained the circumstances of his work in the following manner: "After that I had turned into English, this godly, learned, and comfortable Treatise of Master Th. Beza, of God his eternal Election and Predestination: there came to my hands another copy of the same, Englished by that learned and godly Father, Master Whittingham, and printed in Geneva in the days of Queen Mary." He goes on to add that since his translation was based upon a later revision by Beza of the original work, he felt justified in setting it forth.[95] A second edition of Stockwood's translation, which was entitled *The Treasure of Trueth, Touching the Ground Worke of Man His Salvation, and Chiefest Pointes of Christian Religion: with a Briefe Summe of the Comfortable Doctrine of God His Providence, Compiled in 38 Short Aphorisms*, appeared in 1581.

---

[94] Theodore de Beza, *A Briefe Declaration of the Chiefe Poyntes of Christian Religion, Set Forth in a Table*, [trans. William Whittingham] (London: David Moptid and John Mather, [1575?]).

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Stockwood's translation is the fact that to it were adjoined two other short treatments of predestination. The first of these, by the martyrologist John Foxe, will receive consideration in a later context, as it was undoubtedly an Elizabethan production.[96] The second, however, was by Anthony Gilby, one of the ministers of the Genevan exile congregation, and it had from the beginning been associated with the English translations of Beza's work.

Gilby's tract was entitled *A Briefe Treatise of Election and Reprobation, with Certen Answers to the Objections of the Doctrine*. It was first published in Geneva in 1556, in conjunction with the original publication of Whittingham's translation of Beza, although, as in the case of the latter, this first edition has not survived. And while the two were published separately, by different publishers, it is quite clear from Gilby's preface that he intended his work as a supplement or companion to that of Beza, adding "some brief lessons," as he observes, "for the unlearned (who hath not their senses fully exercised with such deep sentences)."[97]

---

[95] John Stockwood, "The Epistle," *The Treasure of Trueth, Touching the Grounde Worke of Man His Salvation, and Chiefest Pointes of Christian Religion: with a Briefe Summe of the Comfortable Doctrine of God His Providence, Compiled in 38 Short Aphorisms*, by Beza, trans. Stockwood (London: for Thomas Woodcocke, 1576), [pp. 1-2].

[96] *Cf.*, *infra*, pp. 162-64.

A second edition of Gilby's treatise likewise coincided with the re-publication of Whittingham's translation, probably in 1575. Issued without date, by the same London publisher, in the same format, and with the same characters, the two were obviously again intended as companion volumes. Finally, Stockwood placed the two works within the same covers in conjunction with his new translation of Beza in 1576.

Nor were the two works altogether unalike in content. The associations with Geneva and with Beza are not at all misleading indicators as to the tone and character of Gilby's work. To the contrary, indeed his treatise fell squarely in the center of the Calvinist tradition. In fact, his was probably the first complete treatment of the doctrine of predestination from the Calvinist point of view to be produced by the English Reformation; and when viewed in that light the treatise takes on even added significance.

Gilby begins his statement with a reference to an earlier treatment of the doctrine in his own commentary on Malachi, of three years prior. This commentary is no longer extant--indeed, Gilby vaguely attributes its disappearance to "the rage of persecution."[98] And although it is a fairly safe assumption that the later treatise incorporated his earlier ideas, it would have been extremely interesting to trace the development of his doctrine during the first three years of exile had the earlier work survived.

---

[97] Anthony Gilby, A Briefe Treatise of Election and Reprobation, with Certen Answers to the Objections of the Doctrine (London: David Moptid and John Mather, [1575?]), [p. 3].

[98] Ibid., [p. 1].

The basic centrality of predestination to the faith, together with the fact that the doctrine was being challenged, were for Gilby the chief reasons which led him to take up his pen. His plan was to deal first with election and then with reprobation, speaking "none other ways, neither in any other sort, than the open Scriptures shall approve our sayings."[99]

Gilby defines election as "the free choice of the good will of the Almighty God, appointing and prescribing in the Book of life before the beginning of the world, whom he will have to be saved and counted amongst the just, whom he will have holy and without fault before him to be his children by adoption to set forth his glory."[100] Christ died and provided salvation only for the elect, he asserts, and only they can believe and possess faith.

Election is evident, he maintains, "by the spirit of God, working in the hearts of the elect." There can be no doubt about its certainty, for it is dependent upon God rather than man, and God's council "can by no means be altered or changed."[101]

---

[99] Ibid., [p. 6].

[100] Ibid., [pp. 7-8].

[101] Ibid., [pp. 4, 13, 15].

But election is only one side of the picture for Gilby. Reprobation, he feels, must also be declared. This he defines in typically Calvinistic fashion as "the declaration of God his severe justice and just judgement, against the Serpent and his seed, whom, by the word of his eternal wisdom he hath accursed from the beginning, and appointed to everlasting torment."[102] The reprobate, he says, serve God's purposes in the world, their destruction moreso pointing out his mercy to the elect. And since it is God who appoints it, their damnation cannot but be just, for God "offendeth against no law, because his godly will is the law itself."[103] "Far from all fault, crime or sin," he concludes, the doctrine "ought to be known unto us all, that all flesh may tremble, and consider before whom it standeth."[104]

Predestination for Gilby then is "the glad tidings of salvation to the assurance of the faith of the one, and a clear testimony of condemnation of the other."[105]

The last, but certainly not the least important, of the works of the Genevan exiles dealing with predestination was that of John Knox, the Scottish leader of the group. In 1558 the Genevan exile community received from their co-religionists in England, together with a request that they write a refutation, an anonymously composed treatise which was designed to undermine and point out the errors of the doctrine of predestination. The challenge having been accepted, Knox was chosen to write the reply. The resultant work was first published at Geneva in 1560, under the title, An Answer to a Great Nomber of Blasphemous Calvillations Written by an Anabaptist, and Adversarie to God's Eternal Predestination. It was by far the most elaborate literary production to come from Knox's pen, numbering several hundred pages, and was clearly one of the more important theological works to emanate from the exile community.

---

[102] Ibid., [p. 21].

[103] Ibid., [pp. 19, 22].

[104] Ibid., [p. 22].

[105] Ibid., [p. 6].

The treatise against which Knox directed his work was entitled "The Confutation of the Errors of the Careless by Necessity." Whether it was in the form of a printed book or only of a manuscript is not clear; but in either case the original work is no longer extant. Fortunately, however, Knox chose to include verbatim his adversary's text within his own refutation.

As for the identity of the author, although a couple of passages in Knox's treatise would suggest that he had a personal acquaintance with him, he is referred to only as an anonymous Anabaptist. Beyond this, however, the man has somewhat tentatively been identified as one Robert Cooke, a "well-known English Anabaptist."[106] Strype characterizes this Cooke as "a man full of words," but suggests that he was associated with the courts of both Edward VI and Elizabeth, having apparently spent much of the time under Mary among the exiles abroad.[107] But whatever his identity, judging from the sophistication of his arguments one would have to classify him unquestionably as a person of no ordinary acuteness and ability.

---

[106] George Huntston Williams, The Radical Reformation (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962), p. 781. Cf. also, Martin, Les Protestants Anglais Réfugiés à Genève au Temps de Calvin, p. 134; and Burrage, The Early English Dissenters, I, 57-60, II, 7-8.

Cooke's strategy in his "Confutation" was one of pointing toward what he felt were the three capital errors of the predestinarian position. These he takes up in turn, in which context he not only deals with most of the predestinarian arguments, but carries many of them quite effectively to what he sees as their logical absurdity. And it is quite significant that in this regard it is clearly the Calvinist teaching which he attacks, the doctrine of reprobation being more especially the object of his concern than that of election alone.

The first error of the "Careless by Necessity," according to Cooke, is their assertion that

> God hath not created all men to be saved by any manner of means, but before the foundation of the world he hath chosen a certain number to salvation, which is but a small flock, and the rest, which be inumerable, he hath reprobate and ordained to condemnation: Because so it pleaseth Him.[108]

"Now what greater cruelty, tyranny, and oppression can be," he observes, "than to create the most part of the world to everlasting damnation; so that by no manner of mean can they escape and avoid the cruel decree and sentence against them." If this be God's true character, then "must God be worse than the Devil. For the Devil only tempted men to fall, but God compelleth them to fall by his immutable decree. Oh, horrible blasphemy!" Rather, Cooke maintains, "We be all chosen and created in Christ Jesus...and conform to this Election, he lightened all them that came into the world, and calleth all men to repentance, both great and small...without respect of any person."[109]

---

[107] Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, II, i, 111.

[108] Quoted in Knox, An Answer to a Great Nomber of Blasphemous Cavillations Written by an Anabaptist, and Adversarie to God's Eternal Predestination, in The Works of John Knox, V, 36-37.

The second error, according to Cooke, is their contention that

> The Elect, though they sin grievously, yet are they never out of the favor and election of God, neither can they by any means finally perish. So that Adam when he transgressed, and David committing adultery and homicide, were favored even then and beloved of God, and never out of Election, neither could they be. Again, the Reprobate, as Saul and Judas, were never in the favor and election of God, neither could they nor none other Reprobate attain unto salvation.[110]

Such teaching, Cooke asserts, not only encourages careless living, but makes the death of Christ unnecessary, "for his death, you say, belongeth not to the Reprobate, and the Elect have no need of it."[111]

The third error is their teaching that

> God hath two manner of wills, one revealed will, and a secret will, which is only known to Himself. By God's revealed will, men should not come to nought; but they which perish, do perish by his secret will, in respect of God's commandment. It was not God's will that Adam should sin, but in respect of God's secret will, God would Adam to fall.[112]

---

[109] *Ibid.*, pp. 88, 90, 115.

[110] *Ibid.*, p. 206.

[111] *Ibid.*, pp. 206, 248.

[112] *Ibid.*, p. 302.

Finally, Cooke concludes with a somewhat lengthy but telling comparison of the attributes of the "God of the Careless by Necessity" and the "True God":

> The properties of the God of the Careless by Necessity: Their God's wrath exceedeth all his works, for he hath reprobate the most part of the world before the foundation of the world. He is slow unto mercy, and ready to wrath; for he will not be entreated to save any of them whom he hath reprobate before, but of necessity, do what they can, they must be damned: neither is he omnipotent, which may do and leave undone what pleaseth him; for he is bound by his own absolute ordinance and infallible foresight to do only all things as they be done. And because it so pleased him to show his power and strength, he stirred up Pharo, and many more, to do wickedly.... He hath two wills, one contrary to an other; for he saith one thing, and thinketh another. He is worse than the Devil, for not only tempteth he to do evil, but compelleth by immutable fore-ordinance and secret will, without which nothing can be done. He is the Prince of Darkness, for from him come evil thoughts, which are darkness.[113]
>
> The properties of the true God: God his mercy exceedeth all his works. He hath made man like to his own image in Christ Jesus, in whom is no damnation. He is slow unto wrath and ready to forgive; he will be entreated of all, so that he biddeth all men every where to repent, and offereth faith to all men. He is omnipotent, and may do, and leave undone, whatsoever shall be his good pleasure: neither is it his pleasure and will that either Pharao, Semei, or any other, do sin and come to destruction; for he willeth the death of no creature, but willeth all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. He hath but one will, which is ever only good, revealed in his Word to them that fear him and keep his commandments: neither hath he any secret will contrary to this, but will perform whatsoever goeth out of his mouth. He tempteth no man to sin; he is the father of light, and cometh to destroy the works of the Careless Libertine's God, for he abhorreth all wicked doers.[114]

There apparently was no connection between Cooke and the English

---

[113] Ibid., p. 391.

[114] Ibid., p. 395.

Freewillers, who also were frequently classified as Anabaptists, although the similarity of their ideas is at points quite striking. Knox, however, more than once associated his adversary with Sebastian Castellio, the liberal Savoyard thinker who so persistently opposed Calvin's views on predestination; and indeed it would appear that in a number of places Cooke was dependent upon Castellio's works. But whatever its association, the "Confutation" represents probably the clearest as well as the most powerful indictment of the predestinarian position to be produced by the English Reformation.

Such a powerful indictment required an equally forceful reply. Calling his opponent everything from an "enraged dog" to the "Devil incarnate,"[115] Knox reciprocated with a strong defense of the doctrine of predestination, although not infrequently he would appear to have been clearly outclassed by his adversary.

Even more so than his fellow exile Gilby, Knox identified himself completely with the Calvinist position in his reply; and it was that doctrine, in its most rigid sense, that he set out to defend. Not a thinker of original speculative powers himself, Knox drew heavily and quite openly upon the writings of both Calvin and Beza, quite frequently pushing the logic of the Calvinist teaching to its harshest possible conclusions. One can fairly safely characterize his treatise as the strongest pre-Elizabethan statement of the Calvinist doctrine to be produced within the English setting.[116]

---

[115] Knox, _An Answer to a Great Nomber of Blasphemous Cavillations_, in _The Works of John Knox_, V, 392, 393.

The approach used by Knox in his reply, as has already been suggested in part, was one of quoting verbatum the opinions of his antagonist, often at great length, and refuting them section by section, passage by passage. The result was that the treatise has a certain clumsiness about it, and is the occasion of innumerable repetitions--repetitions which are by no means always consistent with themselves. The work is thus more of a collection of fragments than a comprehensive or masterly treatment; and at times it degenerates to little more than a patchwork of scriptural and other quotations, held together by an occasional transitional or interpretive sentence.

Like other Calvinists, Knox attached capital importance to the doctrine of predestination. For him it is not only a theological tenet to be maintained, but it is an integral part of the treasury of the faith as well: "The doctrine of God's eternal Predestination is so necessary to the Church of God, that, without the same, can faith neither be truly taught, nor surely established."[117]

Knox defines predestination then as "the eternal and immutable decree of God, by the which he hath once determined with himself what

---

[116] For useful treatments of Knox's doctrine of predestination, cf., James S. McEwen, The Faith of John Knox (The Croall Lectures, 1960; Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1961), pp. 63-79; and Arthur N. Prior, "The Reformers Reformed: Knox on Predestination," The Presbyter, IV, No. 1 (February, 1946), 19-23.

[117] An Answer to a Great Nomber of Blasphemous Cavillations, in The Works of John Knox, V, 25.

He will have to be done with every man. For he hath not created all... to be of one condition."[118] Rather, there are two categories of men--the elect and the reprobate--and both are the objects of God's eternal decree. "We conclude," he writes,

> that God hath as well his Elect, whom of mercy he calleth, by faith justifieth, and by his holy Spirit sanctified, and in knowledge of himself and of his Son Jesus preserveth to the end, and so in the end shall he glorify them: as also, that he hath his Reprobate, whom for just causes he leaveth to themselves to languish in their corruption, to pass from iniquity to iniquity, till that they come to perdition, as they that are prepared vessels of wrath.[119]

Of the two categories, Knox is by far more interested in the elect. These, he maintains, God has chosen, not on the basis of any merit they might have, but solely according to his good pleasure and will. "Our election," he says, "consisteth not in ourselves, but in the eternal and immutable good pleasure of God." It "dependeth not upon man, upon his will, purpose, pleasure, or dignity; but...it is free, proceeding from grace."[120]

Indeed, it is precisely this aspect of election which for Knox is the ground of the Christian's assurance. And on this point of assurance, like Calvin, Knox places perhaps his greatest stress. The assurance of salvation, he holds, is essential to the Christian; and the only way it is obtainable in a perfect sense is through the realization that one's salvation is based solely upon God's grace through election. "Then only is our salvation in assurance," he writes, "when we find the cause of the same in the bosom and counsel of God."[121]

---

[118] Ibid., p. 36. Cf., Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. John Allen (7th ed., rev. and corr.; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), III, xxi, 5.

[119] An Answer to a Great Nomber of Blasphemous Cavillations, in The Works of John Knox, V, 125.

[120] Ibid., pp. 26, 70.

Along the same line, God's election for Knox is not only certain but immutable--it cannot fail. So established is it that "it cannot be overthrown, neither by the raging storms of the world, nor by the assaults of Satan; neither yet by the wavering and weakness of our own flesh."[122] Though the elect may temporarily falter, they shall finally persevere, for "out of his [God's] hand is none able to take us away."[123]

But just as God's Word is the "sweet odor of life" to some, so also is it necessarily the "savor of death" to others.[124] God's justice as well as his mercy must be displayed; thus Knox defends just as vehemently the doctrine of predestination to damnation. "We (so taught by the Scriptures) with reverence do affirm," he writes, "that God for just causes, albeit unknown and hid to us, hath rejected a part of men." "To those whom he hath decreed to leave in perdition," he continues, "is so shut up the entry of life, that either they are left continually corrupted in their blindness, or else if grace be offered, by them it is impugned and obstinately refused."[125] The principle by which some are selected and others rejected, he maintains, is entirely opaque to man. But it cannot be other than just, since it proceeds from a God whose very nature is justice.[126] Those who would dispute such a doctrine, he concludes, "have not to do with men, as with Augustine, Calvin, and us,...but with the Holy Ghost."[127]

---

[121] Ibid., p. 26.

[122] Ibid.

[123] Ibid., p. 27.

[124] Ibid., p. 21.

While Knox thus gives clear expression to a doctrine of reprobation, it is quite interesting that he vacillates considerably in the rigidity of his views according to the pressure of his opponent. So that quite frequently, although inconsistently, he affirms that man's sin, rather than God's decree as such, is the basic cause of reprobation; and that it is a matter of being passed over, or left in corruption, rather than being a positive sentence on the part of God.[128]

Also interesting is the fact that in the Scottish Confession of Faith, drawn up by Knox and some of his Scottish associates, also in 1560, not a word about reprobation, save an incidental reference to "the reprobate" in a subordinate clause, was included. The eighth article, "Of Election," is altogether positive in its statement, and simply affirms that Christ was predestinated from all eternity to be the saviour of man, and that the elect are chosen in and through Him.[129]

---

[125] _Ibid_., pp. 40, 42.

[126] _Ibid_., p. 114.

[127] _Ibid_., p. 326.

[128] _Ibid_., pp. 91, 105, 112, 394.

The period of the Marian exile then was far from fruitless with regard to the development of the doctrine of predestination. Indeed, one would have to point to at least two things of paramount importance which issued from the period. First, and foremost in importance, was the injection for the first time, at least in an unmistakable sort of way, of the Calvinist influence among the English reformers. There had been occasional traces of Calvinism in earlier developments, as has been indicated from time to time, but these had never amounted to much more than mere personal references and had usually been somewhat questionable in character. But now the Calvinist doctrine was espoused quite openly--and indeed quite aggressively--by Englishmen who were themselves fully and completely committed to the Calvinist system. This could not help but have important repercussions on the later development of the doctrine in England.

Second, and closely related to the above, was the appearance in this period also of the first specific reaction to the Calvinist doctrine within the English context. The anonymous Anabaptist tract can hardly be interpreted in any other light.

And finally, what is especially significant in relation to both of the above, is that the dialogue thus established between these two tendencies or traditions--the Calvinist and the anti-Calvinist--

---

[129] Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom, III, 444-45.

was to repeat itself more than once during the Elizabethan period. In a sense, in fact, it was to be of the essence of the later development of the doctrine in England.

# CHAPTER IV

# THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE EARLY ELIZABETHAN CHURCH

After a none-too-successful reign of five years on the throne of England, Mary died in 1558. Although her policy of counter-Reformation had seemed effective on the surface, she had never succeeded in winning the complete confidence and support of the English people. She was followed on the throne by her twenty-five year old half-sister who became Queen Elizabeth I.

Elizabeth inherited a host of difficult state problems, not the least important of which concerned religion. Her initial policy in that sphere was one of deliberate caution, although from the beginning it was quite apparent that she was deeply committed, for personal as well as other reasons, to the reversal of her predecessor's settlement. The final arrangement in that regard took the form of two parliamentary statutes--the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity. The provisions of those statutes, known collectively as the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion, formed the basis for the development in succeeding years of a broad, moderate, and basically Protestant establishment.

With regard to the doctrine of predestination, while the changed circumstances tended to move other, somewhat more pressing issues into the forefront of theological concern, the early Elizabethan Church witnessed a continued interest in the topic. And although the evidence is not nearly so voluminous as one might expect, there were nevertheless some key developments which issued from the period, and which represent in a sense the culmination of the prior development of the doctrine.

More specifically, the early Elizabethan period witnessed developments along three clearly distinguishable lines. In the first place, that basically moderate tradition, which earlier had been associated with such key reformers as Tyndale, Latimer, and Bradford, and which had been incorporated into the statements of the Edwardian formularies, continued to see representation. In the second place, the Calvinist tradition, which had seen its beginning in the works of the Marian exiles at Geneva, came now fully into its own and began moving toward maturity. And finally, the anti-Calvinist tradition, which had been given initial expression in the anonymous tract attributed to Robert Cooke and answered by John Knox, was now significantly strengthened and expanded. Or to put it somewhat more succinctly, the period witnessed the channeling of the discussion of the doctrine into the three main streams which were to guide and dominate developments in that regard through the remainder of the Tudor period and on into the seventeenth century as well.

## Continuation of the Moderate Tradition

The basic English pattern of moderation, which by the beginning of the Elizabethan period had clearly established itself as the dominate tendency of English thought with regard to the doctrine of predestination, saw continued expression and support in the early Elizabethan period. This support came primarily from two sources: the writings of the major Elizabethan churchmen and the official doctrinal formularies which in that period were put forward by law.

It would be misleading, however, to suggest that the support of either of these groups was anything but modest. Among the major theological writers of the period, one looks almost in vain for extensive treatments of the doctrine. With concern shifting as it was to other more vital issues--issues related to the controversies with the Catholics and with the Puritans--there was something of a decline of interest in the doctrine generally, and among this important group in particular. Such as it was, however, their support did go almost entirely to the moderate position.

Matthew Parker, Elizabeth's first Archbishop of Canterbury, was in many ways typical of the new Elizabethan churchman. More of an ecclesiastic perhaps than a theologian, he produced few works of a theological nature, and none touching upon predestination. Apart from his role in the construction of the Elizabethan formularies (which will be discussed in a later context) the only evidence of his attitude toward the doctrine is the account, preserved by the historian John

Haweis, of his having rebuked a certain Richard Kechyn, curate of a parish near Bocking in Essex, for preaching controversial sermons on the subject. His counsel was toward caution and moderation concerning such deep points of theology, the which he felt were better left to be argued and discussed among the learned.[1]

Perhaps the most respected theologian among the early Elizabethan churchmen was John Jewel, the author of one of the classic apologies for the Elizabethan Settlement. Even his references to predestination, however, were few and far between. In his Exposition upon the Two Epistles of St Paul to the Thessalonians, first published in 1583, it was sufficient for him to note that whereas in their own self men are "blind, the children of wrath, without understanding, without God, and without hope," God has elected from among them a select few whom he has chosen to be his own, and whose calling he has made "sure for ever." The elect "shall not fall from grace," he maintains; the "tokens" of their election are "sanctification and the faith of truth."[2]

---

[1] John Oliver Willyams Haweis, Sketches of the Reformation and Elizabethan Age, Taken from the Contemporary Pulpit (London: William Pickering, 1844), p. 95. Cf. also, Strype, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, the First Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (3 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822), I, 303. It is interesting to note that soon thereafter Kechyn was attacked from the opposite direction--by an itinerant Puritan preacher by the name of Holland, who accused him of not preaching the full faith. "Predestination," Holland is reported to have asserted, "should and ought to be preached in every sermon, and in every place, before all congregations, as the only doctrine of salvation." Haweis, Sketches of the Reformation and Elizabethan Age, p. 95.

[2] John Jewel, The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, ed. John Ayre (The Parker Society Publications; 4 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1845-1850), II, 821, 933, 934.

John Whitgift, Elizabeth's third and last Archbishop of Canterbury, had only slightly more to say about the doctrine. Like Parker he too by temperament was more of an administrator than a speculative thinker, although he was a trained theologian and had in his time been both Lady Margaret and Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. His works nevertheless did include a few important references to predestination. And although Whitgift has frequently been made out to have been a high Calvinist in doctrinal matters, most of what he had to say on predestination was of a fairly moderate character. He had been one of John Bradford's pupils in the time of Edward VI, and in this regard seems to have followed rather closely in the tradition of his master.

Whitgift's controversy in the 1570's with the Cambridge Puritan Thomas Cartwright did not turn primarily on doctrinal issues. Nevertheless, within that context occasional references to predestination and related issues did appear. In his *Defense of the Answer to the Admonition, Against the Reply of Thomas Cartwright*, of 1574, Whitgift made references to both election and reprobation. The elect, he says, are both "chosen in Christ" and "engraffed in Christ." They may fall from time to time, "as men often do," but their election is essentially certain, "for it is not possible that they should perish which are the members of Christ."[3] The "reprobate," on the other hand, are the

---

[3] John Whitgift, *The Works of John Whitgift, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Dean of Lincoln, Etc.*, ed. John Ayre (The Parker Society Publications; 3 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1851), III, 143.

"vessels of anger...appointed to destruction." Although they may for a while appear to be of the elect, they eventually must fall.[4]

Earlier in the same work Whitgift had observed that "as his [God's] mercies be infinite, so be his judgments unsearchable."[5] Elsewhere, in "A Note of Such Dangerous Points of Doctrine as Are Avouched by Thomas Cartwright in His Reply," he chides the prominent Puritan for maintaining that "the doctrine of free-will is not repugnant to salvation," it being, as he observes, "a doctrine clean contrary to free justification by Christ."[6]

Whitgift's comments on the authority of Calvin himself, found in the former work, are both interesting and quite revealing of his attitude as well:

> I reverence M. Calvin as a singular man, and worthy instrument in Christ's church; but I am not so wholly addicted unto him, that I will contemn other men's judgments that in divers points agree not fully with him, especially in the interpretation of some places of the scripture, when as, in my opinion, they come nearer to the true meaning and sense of it in those points than he doth.[7]

Nor have attempts to label Whitgift a Calvinist on the basis of his participation in the Cambridge controversies of the mid-1590's concerning grace and other related issues been successful. Closer examination of those disputes, the details of which lie beyond the scope of this study,[8] have shown, in the words of a recent scholar, "that the Archbishop was something other than a high and dry Calvinist."[9] His role was essentially one of moderating an otherwise quite powerful Calvinist offensive.

---

[4] *Ibid*.

[5] *Ibid*., I, 189.

[6] *Ibid*., III, 552.

[7] *Ibid*., I, 436.

John Foxe, among the more prominent churchmen of the period, probably wrote the most on the subject of predestination. At the same time the famed martyrologist is undoubtedly the most difficult to classify in this regard. He produced two known treatments of the doctrine; and while the first of these was essentially moderate in tone, the second approximated ever so closely the position of the Calvinists.

Foxe's earliest treatment of the doctrine consisted of a short tract which he entitled "Notes Appertaining to the Matter of Election." In its original form the treatise appeared as a sort of excursus within the first English editions (beginning in 1563) of his Acts and Monuments, apparently having been occasioned by the inclusion of some of Bradford's prison letters, upon which it followed. The same tract, however, appeared later in a second form (as has already been previously noted)[10] in conjunction with the publication, as The Treasure of Trueth, of the Elizabethan English translation of one of Theodore de Beza's treatises on predestination. The work was almost entirely positive in approach, and expounded a basically moderate line of doctrine.

---

[8] Ibid., infra, pp. 244-46.

[9] Harry Culverwell Porter, "The Anglicanism of Archbishop Whitgift," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XXXI, No. 2 (June, 1962), 128. Cf. also, Victor John Knight Brook, Whitgift and the English Church (Teach Yourself History Library; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957), pp. 158-65; Powel Mills Dawley, John Whitgift and the English Reformation (The Hale Lectures, 1953; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), pp. 208-21; and W. D. Sargeaunt, "The Lambeth Articles," The Journal of Theological Studies, XII, No. 46 (January, 1911), 257-60.

More specifically, Foxe set out in the treatise to consider some of the more elementary aspects of election--what it is, how it effects salvation, to whom it pertains, and whether or not one can be certain of it. By way of some introductory definitions, he draws a clear distinction between predestination and election, the former being the broader, the latter the narrower term. "Predestination," he maintains, "is the eternal decreement of God, purposed before in himself, what shall befall on all men, either to salvation or damnation."[11] "Election," on the other hand, "is the free mercy and grace of God in his own will, through faith in Christ his Son, choosing and preferring to life such as pleaseth him."[12] It is only with the latter at this point that Foxe is concerned.

As for the cause of election, it is for Foxe solely the will of God through his mercy and grace. Works and merit of all kinds are categorically excluded from consideration. "If the question be asked," he writes, "Why was Abraham chosen, and not Nahor? Why was Jacob chosen, and not Esau?...Why few be chosen, and the most forsaken? It cannot be answered otherwise than thus: because it was so the good will of God."[13]

---

[10] Cf., supra, p. 141.

[11] Foxe, The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, VII, 268.

[12] Ibid., pp. 268-69.

On the other hand, the recipients of election are said to be "whosoever believeth in Christ Jesus." But Foxe makes it quite clear that such as believe, do so only "through the vocation of God."[14]

As for the matter of assurance, Foxe maintains that the elect can as a matter of fact know with certainty that they are elected. In this regard, the "cause certificatory" is said to be a firm faith in Jesus Christ: "Wherefore, whosoever desireth to be assured that he is one of the elect number of God, let him not climb up to heaven to know, but let him descend into himself, and there search his faith in Christ the Son of God."[15]

Foxe's second treatment of the doctrine was different in many respects from the first. It took the form of a controversial treatise, of which he was only part author, and even that not altogether by his own choice. The work was entitled *Against Jerome Osorius, Byshop of Silvane in Portingall, and Against His Slanderous Invectives: An Aunswere Apologeticall, for the Necessary Defence of the Evangelical Doctrine and Veritie*, and formed a part of the Haddon-Osorio controversy of the early Elizabethan period.

---

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 272.

[15] *Ibid.*

Walter Haddon, the primary author of the work, was a prominent Elizabethan churchman and Latinist, who, in 1563, had been chosen to answer a somewhat pretentious epistle addressed earlier the same year to Elizabeth by Jerome Osorio, an accomplished Ciceronian and later a bishop in the Portuguese Church. Osorio's epistle, which was as much a display of ornate Latinity as a work of serious divinity, had suggested that the English Reformation was in gross error, and had urged that Elizabeth re-establish in her realm the true Catholic faith. Haddon's reply had taken the form of an apology, not only for the Elizabethan Settlement, but for Protestantism in general as well.

Four years later, in 1567, Osorio had renewed the debate by publishing a reply to Haddon's answer. Shortly thereafter Haddon had begun yet another response, the present work, but had died in 1572 with the project only half completed. Whereupon Foxe, at the urging of his friends, finished the work, which was first published in a Latin edition in 1577, and then in an English translation by James Bell in 1581.[16]

Of the completed treatise about half of the second and all of the third and final book were entirely the work of Foxe. And while the overall debate is perhaps more properly considered a mere rhetorical exchange between Latin stylists,[17] the work of Foxe did constitute a significant contribution to the serious theological literature of the day.

---

[16] Lawrence V. Ryan, "The Haddon-Osorio Controversy (1563-1583)," Church History, XXII, No. 2 (June, 1953), 142-54.

[17] Ryan suggests that the whole affair "was more notorious than theologically significant." Ibid., p. 153.

A large portion of the section of the treatise written by Foxe was taken up by a rather lengthy although somewhat repetitious discussion of the doctrine of predestination and related issues. And what is especially important is the fact that the doctrine there set forth differs quite significantly from that of Foxe's earlier work. While Foxe is not always altogether consistent with himself, he comes extremely close to an espousal of the Calvinist doctrine.

On election Foxe's statements correspond fairly closely to the views represented in his earlier treatise. "If ye ask here," he writes at one point, "the cause of his free mercy, according to the good pleasure of his will; if ye seek the mean, in Christ Jesus; if ye look for the end, to work good deeds, not for the good deeds' sake, nor for any our deservings, but to the praise of the glory of his grace."[18]

On the negative side of the doctrine, however, Foxe moves well beyond the near-silence of the earlier work. And at least initially, he seems to espouse the basic Calvinist doctrine of reprobation. "Before the foundations of the world were laid," he writes toward the beginning of the discussion, "he [God] hath predestinated them whom he would should be saved, and rejected them whom he would have damned."

---

[18] Walter Haddon, and Foxe, Against Jerome Osorius, Byshop of Silvane in Portingall, and Against His Slanderous Invectives: An Aunswere Apologeticall, for the Necessary Defence of the Evangelicall Doctrine and Veritie, trans. James Bell (London: John Daye, 1581), fols. 131b-132a.

These are the "vessels of mercy" and the "vessels of wrath" respectively; and the "fountain and original of them both is the decree of God."[19]

Such introductory statements in themselves might well pass for Calvinism. But later in the treatise, as Foxe begins to reflect the pressure of the logic of his opponent's arguments, he is compelled to elaborate further on a number of key points, and especially on the issue of the cause of reprobation; and it would appear that in the course of this elaboration he is forced to compromise to a significant extent the basic Calvinism of his initial statements.

In brief, while the will and pleasure of God are still held to be the final cause of reprobation, the more immediate and direct cause is conceded to be man's own sinfulness. Although the reprobate are "fashioned unto destruction, by the will of God," yet they themselves "also do procure to themselves their own destruction."[20] The will of God is the "first and sovereign," while man's sin is the "middle and proper cause" of reprobation.[21] So that no man is condemned "but he that through his own default doth purchase to himself damnation."[22]

Toward the end of the discussion Foxe sums up his views in the following manner:

> To conclude. Albeit the salvation of the elect and the destruction of the reprobate do proceed both from one original, namely, from the secret counsel of Almighty God, yet this

---

[19] Ibid., fols. 200b, 204a.

[20] Ibid., fol. 200a.

[21] Ibid., fol. 224b.

[22] Ibid., fol. 204b.

> same decree nevertheless doth not express itself after one manner at all times, if you have regard to the manner of the operation. For the cause of the salvation of such as are saved is so wholly shut up in the closet of God's mercy, that God only and alone is the whole and only efficient cause thereof; so that the same can by no means be ascribed to any other. But the damnation of the reprobate, albeit cannot escape the knowledge of the most secret purpose of God (because no one thing, be it of never so small value, can be done without his will), yet if we seek the true and efficient cause thereof, whereunto may it be more properly imputed than to sin, and to the devil, the father of sin?[23]

Thus while Foxe comes perhaps as close to Calvinism as any of the major Elizabethan churchmen--indeed to the very brink thereof--nevertheless in the final analysis he is probably more properly classified in this regard as an exponent of the moderate tradition. In spite of the close association of his earlier work with, and the close approximation of his later work to, the tradition, Foxe himself was no Calvinist propagandist. The extent to which he moderated and qualified the Calvinist doctrine would rule out any legitimate application of the Genevan label.

Finally, the moderate tradition counted among its supporters two churchmen whose theological works took on something of a semi-official character in the early Elizabethan Church--Alexander Nowell and Thomas Rogers. Alexander Nowell composed at least three religious catechisms in this period, the larger of which received the endorsement of the Convocation in 1563, although it was not published until 1570. In its original Latin form, as well as in an English translation by Thomas Norton (also the translator of a number of Calvin's works, including his Institutes of the Christian Religion), the catechism proved to be one of the most widely used and influential religious manuals of the period. It went through a number of further editions in the course of the 1570's and 1580's.

---

[23] *Ibid*., fol. 205a.

Although Nowell's catechism contained no specific discussion of the doctrine of predestination, it did touch upon the subject in the section dealing with the Church. There mention was made of "those whom God by his secret election hath adopted to himself through Christ."[24] The Church itself is defined in part as "the universal number and fellowship of all the faithful, whom God through Christ hath before all beginning of time appointed to everlasting life."[25] In the following passage the same theme is elaborated upon more fully:

> Before that the Lord God made heaven and earth, he determined to have to himself a certain most beautiful kingdom and most holy commonweal....Into this, as into his own city, God did incorporate an infinite multitude of men, which must all be subject, serviceable, and obedient to Christ their only king, and which have all committed themselves to his protection, and of whom he hath taken upon him to be defender, and doth continually maintain and preserve them....They that be stedfast, stable, and constant in this faith, were chosen and appointed, and (as we term it) predestinated to this so great felicity, before the foundations of the world were laid.[26]

---

[24] Alexander Nowell, A Catechism, Written in Latin, by Alexander Nowell, Dean of St Paul's; Together with the Same Catechism Translated into English by Thomas Norton, ed. George Elwes Corrie (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1853), p. 174.

[25] Ibid., p. 172.

[26] Ibid., p. 171.

Of almost equal importance was Thomas Rogers' commentary on the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, the new Elizabethan doctrinal formulary which, as will be seen later, differed only slightly from that of Edward VI. The commentary was first published in 1579 under the title, *The English Creed; Wherein Is Contained in Tables an Exposition on the Articles Which Every Man Is To Subscribe unto*; but it saw numerous subsequent editions under various different titles and forms. As the first attempt toward an exposition of the official doctrinal standard of the church, and as the work of a man who soon was to be the chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the commentary very early acquired a considerable authority.

Rogers' method of commentary was one of compiling in connection with each of the articles a list of positive propositions to be asserted, along with a list of errors to be avoided. From the seventeenth article--that dealing with predestination--ten different propositions were drawn, including the following:

> They which are predestinate unto salvation cannot perish.
>
> Not all men, but certain, are predestinate to be saved.
>
> In Christ Jesus, of the mere will and purpose of God, some are elected, and not others, unto salvation.[27]

Among the errors which Rogers lists are, that "some are appointed to be saved, but none to be damned"; that "the very elect, totally and finally, may fall from grace, and be damned"; that "the number of those which be predestinate may both increase and be diminished"; and that "God beheld in every man whether he would use his grace well, and believe the gospel or no; and as he saw a man affected, so he did predestinate, choose, or refuse him."[28]

---

[27] Thomas Rogers, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England: An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, ed. John James Stewart Perowne (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1854), p. 143.

Thus the writings of many of the major Elizabethan churchmen lent continued support to that basically moderate tradition of English predestinarian thought. And certainly the sympathies of a number of other prominent churchmen, whose treatments of the doctrine were of such a limited character as to preclude definite classification, must have lain with the same cause.[29] And what is perhaps most important of all is the fact that the positions of prominence and authority occupied by this group generally, tended to add even greater weight and authority to the tradition.

The second source of support for the moderate tradition in the early Elizabethan Church was the official doctrinal formularies which by law were put forward in that period. They include the Elizabethan Prayer Book, the Second Book of Homilies, and the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. And the one thing which they all shared in common was a rather close continuity with their Edwardian antecedents. It would not be far from the truth to say that the Elizabethan formularies represented little more than confirmation or reaffirmation of the positions incorporated in the standards put forward by Edward VI. This would in particular be true with regard to the doctrine of predestination; and, as has already been shown, the tendencies of the Edwardian formularies were definitely toward moderation in that regard.

---

[28] _Ibid_., pp. 145, 147, 149.

[29] Among these one would list in particular Edmund Grindal, Elizabeth's second Archbishop of Canterbury, Edwin Sandys, William Fulke, and John Woolton.

Of the new formularies the first to receive official approval was the Elizabethan Prayer Book. It was authorized by law for use in the churches in 1559; and although a number of minor revisions and alterations were effected, the work remained essentially the same as the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. None of the changes had any bearing upon its moderate references to predestination.

The Second Book of Homilies followed four years later, when in 1563 it also received the official endorsement of the Convocation. The new series of twenty sermons were intended to supplement the original Edwardian twelve. As before, the new homilies were characteristically non-theological in nature, deliberately avoiding all controversial points of doctrine, including predestination. By their very silence on the latter issue, however, they lent basic support to the moderate approach.

The most crucial of the new formularies--at least from the viewpoint of the development of the doctrine of predestination--was of course the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. By the same token its evolution was the most complicated and involved. Of the three formularies final approval for it came last.

The relationship between the Elizabethan articles and those of

Edward VI was also close, as has already been suggested. But it was not quite as direct as has often been assumed. There were at least two important developments which intervened, and which, for the purposes of this study, require prior consideration.

Following the death of Edward VI the Forty-Two Articles of Religion were quietly dropped from use. Nor were they immediately revived upon the accession of Elizabeth. But as early as the spring of 1559 they were brought to the attention of the Elizabethan Church again, if in a somewhat indirect way. At that time an anonymous group of Protestant leaders--probably returning exiles--presented to Elizabeth a declaration of their doctrinal opinions. Entitled "A Declaration of Doctrine, Offered and Exhibited by the Protestants to the Queen, at the First Coming Over of Them," the statement was modeled closely on the Edwardian standard and actually repeated many of its articles verbatim. Its purpose apparently was to disprove certain charges of heresy which had been leveled against the anonymous authors.

Quite significantly, the declaration laid particular stress upon the tenet of predestination. Along with those dealing with the freedom of the will and original sin, the Edwardian article on election and predestination was repeated almost verbatim. And what is perhaps even more important is the fact that to the latter there was appended a somewhat lengthy apology which elaborated even further the predestinarian views of the group. While expressing basic support for the position of the Edwardian article, the statement counseled even further moderation upon the subject. Witness the quiet dignity of the following representative passage:

> This Article of God's predestination and election, as it is most true, so it is a high and weighty matter and a most deep mystery: and therefore when just cause is offered to entreat of it either in sermons or otherwise, it is to be done with great consideration and discernment; and the hearers or readers of books written in this matter ought to lay apart all carnal curiosity, as it is aforesaid in the Article. For whosoever gathereth upon the consideration of God's election or of the weakness of man's nature either encouragement to carnal and ungodly life, either a dulness or slothfulness to piety and godly exercises, let him assure himself that he hath no right consideration neither of himself nor of God's merciful sure goodness promised us in Christ. For those agitations which proceed from God's Spirit tend always to the overthrow of the Devil's work and sin, and not contrariwise to minister provocations unto sin. And although many godly men in these our days will think that in this our corrupt age, in the which men are given to all rashness of judgment and dissoluteness of life, and do not weigh the mysteries of our faith with such Christian humility as they ought to do, it were best that such Articles should be passed over in silence (indeed we do think that discreet ministers will speak sparely and circumspectly of them, and that upon the consideration before rehearsed), yet notwithstanding, seeing some men are risen of late which do gainsay and oppugn this truth, we cannot utterly pass over this matter with silence.... Notwithstanding we do not despair but that such are curable; and through fair and open preaching of the Gospel will be brought to see and understand the truth better than hitherto they have done. For truth it is that these and other most grievous errors have increased in this realm in these late years for want of true preaching.[30]

Not long after the presentation of the above declaration, and before the end of the year, a second document related to the Edwardian articles appeared. Deeply concerned at this point with the problem of doctrinal unity within the church, Archbishop Parker and his episcopal associates drew up, on their own authority, a brief statement which was intended to serve as a provisional test of orthodoxy. Consisting of eleven articles--and indeed known historically as the Eleven Articles--the formulary was heavily dependent upon the Forty-Two Articles of Edward VI, amounting as a matter of fact to little more than a condensation of the larger work.

---

[30] Included in Dixon, History of the Church of England, V, 109-10.

In view of the source of their origin, the Eleven Articles are perhaps as important for what was left out as for what was included; and they deliberately avoided most speculative topics. Specifically, no mention at all was made in the Articles of the doctrine of predestination. Now in the light of Parker's known sentiments upon this subject, it would probably not be stretching the matter too far to view such an omission as this as a sign of official discouragement of discussion of the doctrine.[31]

Meanwhile Parker had from the beginning also been working toward a full-length revision of the Edwardian formulary for later adoption by the Elizabethan Church. The Archbishop's efforts in this regard eventually resulted in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion.

The effect of Parker's own criticism of the Edwardian standard was to add four new articles, to eliminate an equal number, and to modify seventeen of the remainder. Further revisions, ultimately reducing the number of articles to thirty-nine, were made by the Convocation, before whom the project was brought in 1563. The finished work, which was approved by the same body, was published in an initial Latin edition before the end of the year. The official Latin and English editions of 1571 incorporated the final revisions and alterations.

---

[31] Charles A. Hardwick has printed the Eleven Articles in _A History of the Articles of Religion; to Which Is Added a Series of Documents, from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615, Together with Illustrations from Contemporary Sources_, rev. Francis Proctor (3rd ed., rev.; London: George Bell and Sons, 1876), pp. 355-59.

Most of the articles touching upon predestination and related issues were left virtually intact by the revision. The articles on original sin and on sin against the Holy Ghost remained essentially the same. The one on the freedom of the will was expanded, but not in such a way as to change its original meaning. And although the article on grace was omitted altogether, no compromise of its position was intended, as the same doctrine was by implication expounded in a number of other articles as well.[32]

The seventeenth article, that dealing specifically with election and predestination, underwent some minor changes, but none of them altering significantly its meaning. The principal changes had to do with the insertion of the words "in Christ" in the first paragraph and the deletion of the phrase, "although the Decrees of Predestination are unknown unto us," in the last. But if anything such modifications resulted in an even further softening and restraining of an already relatively moderate statement.

---

[32] For a comparison of the articles of 1553 with those of 1571, cf., Hardwick, A History of the Articles of Religion, pp. 289-353.

Thus the Elizabethan formularies added in large measure the weight of their official support also to the moderate tradition. Generally speaking they did not move significantly beyond the position of their Edwardian antecedents. Rather they represented more of a reassertion of the moderate predestinarian views of the earlier works.

## Advance of the Calvinist Tradition

If the moderate position on predestination was espoused within the official circles of the early Elizabethan Church, it was by no means the only view which saw circulation. Tendencies in two other (mutually opposing) directions clearly marked the period as well. The Calvinist tradition at one extreme and the anti-Calvinist at the other were both far from lacking in representation and support.

The continued advance of Calvinist predestinarian ideas within English thought was undoubtedly one of the more significant developments of the early Elizabethan period. During the first years of Elizabeth the tradition rapidly acquired adherents in England; and by the middle of the reign it had clearly established itself as a formidable challenge to the more moderate view.

The advance of these ideas, of course, was not an entirely isolated phenomenon. On the contrary, it was closely related to and formed an integral part of that much broader process by which Calvinism in general as a comprehensive theological system was beginning to emerge as an influential and determinative force in English life and thought. The doctrine of predestination was only one among many Calvinist ideas which in this period were beginning to gain acceptance in England.

In this connection the association between the advance of the Calvinist doctrine and some of the factors related to this broader development is a matter of more than casual significance. Indeed, the advance of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination in the early Elizabethan period can be properly understood only in the light of its dependence upon at least two such related developments--the return of the English Protestant exiles from the continent on the one hand, and the rise of the Puritan party within the English Church on the other.

No sooner had the news of the death of Mary reached the English exiles abroad than preparations began to be made for the return across the channel. Within a few months most of the group had made their way back to England again, where with astonishing rapidity they began to make their presence and influence felt. Not a few of the initial Elizabethan appointees to the episcopal bench were drawn from the group, to say nothing of the scores of exiles who took less prominent positions in church, government, and university.[33]

Among these exiles there were many, of course, who returned from the continent Calvinists in their theology. To be sure, the Genevan party as such probably represented little more than a small minority, but the number of those who in a broader sense had come under the influence of Calvin's thought was certainly substantial.[34] It is therefore not surprising that the returned exiles were to play an important part in the advance of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination. Indeed, as will be seen, a number of the key exponents of the doctrine in the period were to have definite associations with the exile group.

---

[33] _Cf_., Wyndham Mason Southgate, "The Marian Exiles and the Influence of John Calvin," _History_, N.S., XXVII, No. 106 (September, 1942), 148-52; and S. J. Knox, "The Genevan Exiles after the Exile," _The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England_, XI, No. 2 (May, 1957), 89-100.

The rise of the Puritan party in England was closely but not exclusively associated with the return of the Marian exiles. Building upon a somewhat broader and a somewhat more comprehensive base, the Puritans in the early Elizabethan period put together an aggressive and well organized party of dissent and reform, taking exception with the Anglican establishment particularly on matters of worship and ecclesiastical discipline.

While theological issues as such were not in the forefront of the early Puritan program of reform, the party was nevertheless basically Calvinistic in most points of doctrine. In the words of Marshall M. Knappen, "Calvin cast such a deep shadow over the Puritan world that he determined the tone of its entire thinking."[35] Again, therefore, it is not surprising that the rise of this party was to contribute significantly to the advance of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination. According to William Haller it is not too much even to claim that predestination was "the central dogma of Puritanism." For Haller, "the history of Puritan thought in England is primarily the history of the setting forth of the basic doctrine of predestination in terms calculated to appeal to the English populace."[36]

---

[34] Leonard J. Trinterud most certainly overstates the case when he claims that "not one of the Genevan party ever gained an important role in the Elizabethan English Church." Trinterud, "The Origins of Puritanism," *Church History*, XX, No. 1 (March, 1951), 45.

[35] Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p. 376.

Drawing upon both of these areas of support, the earliest actual expressions of the Calvinist doctrine in the new period came within the context of a somewhat minor controversy on the subject which occurred during the first years of Elizabeth's reign. Although short in duration and inconsequential in overall effect, the dispute is nevertheless well documented, a number of publications having been issued during its course.

Actually the controversy witnessed expressions not only of the Calvinist position, but of the anti-Calvinist as well. Indeed, it is most properly looked upon as the first of a long series of dialogues between the two traditions which were to run through most of the Elizabethan reign and which were perhaps to be the most important contribution of the period to the development of the doctrine.

Three active participants were involved in the controversy: John Veron and Robert Crowley representing the Calvinist position, and a John Champneys representing the anti-Calvinist point of view. In a broader sense, however, a number of the persons and writings associated with the Marian period were involved in the dispute as well. The whole controversy, in fact, looked backward almost as much as it did forward. Each of the active participatns, as will be seen, were themselves to be in some way or other related to the developments of the previous reign, an important element of continuity between the two periods thus being provided.

---

[36] William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism; or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press, from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), pp. 83, 85. Along the same line Wilbur K. Jordan speaks of "the central position of the doctrine of predestination in the Puritan dogmatic system." Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England, from the Beginning of the English Reformation to the Death of Queen Elizabeth (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1932), p. 242.

The most distinguished figure of the controversy was undoubtedly John Veron. A Frenchman by birth, Veron had migrated to England in 1536, where he had settled as a student at Cambridge University. Ordained to the Anglican priesthood in 1551, he had been made rector of St. Alphage, Cripplegate, the following year.

In Veron there is represented a definite and direct link between the Marian prison controversy and the predestinarian activity of the early Elizabethan period. In 1553 he was deprived of his benefice and, along with John Bradford, was committed to the Tower in London as a "seditious preacher."[37] Remaining a prisoner through the rest of Mary's reign, Veron escaped martyrdom only by virtue of his foreign nationality. Throughout the prison controversy he was quite closely associated with Bradford and the predestinarian party, his name appearing not infrequently within the correspondence of the group.[38]

---

[37] Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, III, i, 77.

[38] *Cf.*, Bradford, The Writings of John Bradford, II, 83.

Upon his release at Elizabeth's accession, Veron was honored with new ecclesiastical appointments. Among other preferments he was appointed prebendary of St. Paul's and was made one of the chaplains to the Queen.

Of the three controversialists Veron was certainly the most prolific writer and translator. During the reign of Edward VI he had published several polemical works of his own and had translated a number of others from among the writings of the major Swiss reformers. After his release from prison he again turned to literary activities, producing altogether some fifteen separate titles by the time of his death in the early 1560's.

Not the least important among Veron's Elizabethan writings were the two, published probably in 1561, which gave rise to the controversy over predestination. Dealing with predestination and the freedom of the will respectively, the companion volumes were entitled *A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination, and of the Devyne Providence of God, as Far [Set] Forth as the Holy Scriptures and Word of God Shal Lead Us*, and *A Moste Necessary Treatise of Free Wil, Not Onlye Against the Papistes, but also Against the Anabaptists, Which in These Our Daies, Go About To Renue the Detestable Heresies of Pelagius, and of the Luciferians*. Both works were dedicated to Queen Elizabeth and both were written in dialogue form.

Of the two writings the one on predestination was probably the most distinguished and was certainly the most relevant to the controversy at hand. The outgrowth of a set of divinity lectures delivered at St. Paul's cathedral, the treatise proposed to deal, both by way of positive exposition, and by way of answering the principal objections, with the basic doctrine of predestination and related points. Directed against "the pestiferous sect of the free will men of our times," the treatise was designed to "enarm and fence the true church of God" against such "traitors" and "robbers of God's glory"--obvious references to the Elizabethan successors of the Edwardian and Marian Freewill groups.[39]

In the treatise itself, while Veron did not deliberately set out to expound the Calvinist view of predestination, many aspects of the Genevan doctrine were nevertheless distinctly articulated. Actually Veron cites Augustine, that "holy ancient father,"[40] more than any other authority--indeed, at times his work takes the form of a running commentary upon selected passages from Augustine--but even so, one highly suspects that much of the time Veron is reading Augustine through the spectacles of Calvin's works; for time and again he sides with the Calvinist position at those crucial points where the Genevan reformer and the Bishop of Hippo part company.

At the very outset of his inquiry Veron sets up two guidelines for his examination of the doctrine: he will "wade in it no farther than scripture and word of God doth lead," and he will "hide nothing from the true church of god, that is revealed unto us in the book."[41] "As soon as we be once past the limits and bounds of God's word," he later adds, perhaps paraphrasing a passage from Calvin, "we must needs run out of the way, and wander in darkness, where of necessity we must needs err, stumble, and fall down every foot."[42] A certain "learned ignorance" concerning the deeper mysteries of God is counseled; and yet one must be careful not to keep the scriptural doctrine from the faithful, "lest we seem either malitiously to defraud them of so high a benefit...or to accuse the holy ghost, as though he had set forth and published things, which it had been better to keep closed."[43]

---

[39] John Veron, _A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination, and of the Devyne Providence of God, as Far_ [Set] _Forth as the Holy Scriptures and Word of God Shal Lead Us_ (London: John Tisdale, [1561]), [pp. iv, v].

[40] _Ibid._, [p. xii].

Veron gives the following general definition of the doctrine of predestination:

> Predestination...is the eternal and everlasting decree of god, whereby he hath determined with himself, what he will have to be done with every man, or whereby he hath from the beginning, appointed to save some men, and some to condemn and cast away.[44]

For Veron, as for Calvin, predestination is based solely and exclusively upon the pleasure and will of God. Man's works and merits, actual or foreseen, are equally irrelevant to the issue, for God's action is totally without regard to the condition of the subject.

---

[41] Ibid., [pp. xii-xiii].

[42] Ibid., [p. 7]. Cf., Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, III, xxi, 2.

[43] A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination, [pp. 11, 51]. Cf., Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, III, xxi, 2, 3.

[44] A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination, [p. 15]. Cf., Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, III, xxi, 5.

This is particularly true of the positive side of the doctrine. "The only thing that moveth him [God] to be merciful or to show mercy and compassion," he asserts, "is only his blessed will and pleasure."[45] "The grace of God," he declares citing Augustine, "doth not find us worthy to be chosen, but maketh us worthy."[46]

Those thus selected, Veron continues, God "hath chosen in his son Jesus Christ before the foundations of the world were laid."[47] These He doth "call by the outward preaching of his word, and by the inward sanctifying of his holy spirit, planting in them a true lively faith in his son Jesus Christ."[48] Indeed, this two-fold calling and the consequent faith in Christ are for the believer the certification and "infallible tokens" of election.[49] Or, to put it another way, "If we be once graffed in Christ and have fellowship with him, then have we a most evident, plain and infallible testimony, that we are written in the book of life."[50]

Nor is there any element of doubt in Veron's mind concerning the final preservance of the elect. God's calling in this regard "is without repentance." "They which be once chosen in Christ Jesus unto life everlasting," he writes, "can never perish, since that they are committed to the custody and keeping of the high shepherd of our saviour Jesus Christ, out of whose hands they can not be plucked nor taken away."[51] Veron is aware, of course, that some men are given to serve Christ only for a season; and as long as such abide among true believers, he counsels, they are not to be too rashly judged.[52] But these must eventually fall--"Indeed by their falling away, they do manifestly declare that they were never of the number of the elect and chosen of God."[53]

---

[45] A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination, [p. 32].

[46] Ibid.

[47] Ibid., [p. xvi].

[48] Ibid., [p. 15].

[49] Ibid., [pp. 16, 73, 88, 90].

[50] Ibid., [p. 86].

Finally, as with Calvin, the most practical value of the doctrine for Veron is the assurance of salvation which it provides for the elect. "There is a certain security and confidence," he writes, "which is most holy and godly, and which cannot be separated from the true faith."[54] "We need not then to be in doubt of our salvation," he adds, "since that it hangeth not of the dignity or worthiness of men, but of the free mercy of God."[55] But "take away the right understanding of the matter of predestination, [and] the assurance of our salvation, which springeth of the free election of god...is clean overthrown."[56]

---

[51] Ibid., [pp. xvii-xviii, 107].

[52] Ibid., [pp. 98, 112].

[53] Ibid., [p. 113].

[54] Ibid., [p. 103].

[55] Ibid., [p. 124].

It is with regard to the negative side of the doctrine, of course, that Veron's Calvinist tendencies show up most clearly. "God did create some," he asserts, "whom he knew perfectly before should go to damnation." These he did "appoint and ordain unto death and condemnation, and to be the vessels of his wrath," that through them "his might, justice, and power may be set forth, and his name declared throughout all the whole world."[57]

As for the cause of reprobation, Veron is quite clear that it is "the only pleasure and will of God."[58] He specifically rejects the view that the wicked perish by the "permission, and sufferance of God," maintaining rather that it is precisely by His "will and appointment" that they are damned.[59] He concludes on this issue in the following manner:

> Therefore, if we can assign none other cause, why God doth show mercy on his elect, but only his blessed will and pleasure, we shall also be fain to confess that he doth reprove the other, only because that it is his pleasure so to do. For, when it is said, that God doth show mercy on whom he will, and whom he will again, he maketh hard hearted: men are admonished and warned thereby, that they ought to seek for none other cause of his divine Predestination, but only his blessed will and pleasure.[60]

---

[56] Ibid., [pp. vi-vii].

[57] Ibid., [pp. 16, 44-45, 49].

[58] Ibid., [p. 35].

[59] Ibid., [pp. 53-54].

[60] Ibid., [p. 35].

On the question of whether or not God is just in so reprobating the vast majority of men, Veron declares in typically Calvinist fashion that "the holy and blessed will of God is [itself] the most consumate and perfect rule of justice and equity"; so that therefore "whatsoever he will, we must count it most just and righteous, only because that he doth will it."[61] The reasons of God's justice may indeed be incomprehensible to and hidden from man; but this does not make God any less just.[62]

In any case, all men deserve damnation anyway, Veron continues. Apart from God's grace mankind is but a "corrupted lump of damnation."[63] Man's wickedness would merit eternal punishment even apart from God's decree. "Let them not therefore accuse God of iniquity and unrighteousness," he concludes, "because that by his eternal judgement they are ordained unto death, which of their own nature they be subject unto."[64]

As for the question of whether or not God may be partial in choosing some but not others from among equally corrupt men, Veron simply answers that "God may give his grace to whom he will."[65] And on the moral problem of the righteousness of God in condemning the reprobate while yet unborn and undeserving of damnation, Veron is finally forced to sidestep the issue by resorting to the favorite and classic reply of Calvin when pushed against the wall: "O thou man, what art thou, that disputest with God?"[66]

---

[61] Ibid., [p. 36].

[62] Ibid., [pp. 43ff.].

[63] Ibid., [p. 50].

[64] Ibid., [p. 39].

[65] Ibid., [p. 61].

In the preface to his treatise Veron had predicted that by publishing such a book he would more than likely incur "many enemies."[67] To a degree this turned out to be no mean prophecy, for within the same year a response to the work appeared. Composed in the form of a letter, written anonymously but known from other sources to have been the work of one John Champneys, it bitterly attacked Veron's predestinarian position, assailing a number of other recent English Calvinist writings on the subject as well. As an alternative, a strongly anti-Calvinist doctrine was set forth.

Consideration of the character and ideas of Champneys' work properly belongs to a later discussion, of course, since he represents one of the first and most important of the anti-Calvinist reactions in the early Elizabethan Church.[68] He is important within the present context, however, not only for his attack upon Veron's work, but also because his response elicited two defensive replies on the part of the Calvinists--replies which had the effect both of continuing the present controversy and of further advancing the Calvinist offensive in the early Elizabethan Church.

---

[66] Ibid., [p. 38].

[67] Ibid., [p. vii].

[68] Cf., infra, pp. 207-212.

Veron himself authored the first of the replies to Champneys. Within the same year (probably 1561) he published a defense of his doctrine under the title, An Apology or Defence of the Doctryne of Predestination, Sette Foorth by the Quenes Hyghnesse Her Most Humble and Obedyent Subject John Veron. Dedicated to the Queen again, the apology was appended to a new edition of the original treatise.

Veron's approach in his defense was one of refuting item by item the objections to his doctrine raised by his adversary. Drawing overwhelmingly upon the support of two sources--the Scriptures and the writings of Augustine--he set about to prove "the infallible truth of my doctrine."[69] Actually very little in the way of new ideas was included in the apology, but Veron did use the occasion to further refine some of his original points.

The second reply to Champneys was written by Robert Crowley, one of whose Edwardian works had been among those criticized in Champney's letter. A controversial author, printer, and divine, Crowley had as early as the reign of Henry VIII been attracted to the doctrines of the Protestant Reformation and had become an active reformer in England in the time of Edward VI. Under Mary he chose to go abroad with the exile group and soon found himself supporting the Anglican party in the religious dispute at Frankfort. Eventually, however, he settled at Geneva, where he definitely became associated with the Genevan party of exiles.[70]

---

[69] Veron, A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination and of the Divine Providence of God, with an Apology of the Same, Against the Swynyshe Gruntinge of the Epicures and Atheystes of Oure Time (London: John Tisdale, [1561?]), fols. 15b-16a.

Returning to England in 1559, in quick succession Crowley was made Archdeacon of Hereford and a prebendary of St. Paul's. Almost just as quickly he found himself pushed into the camp of the Puritans by the policies of the Anglican hierarchy concerning such things as the wearing of clerical vestments.[71]

The work of Crowley mentioned by Champneys was one which had been published, probably in 1548, under the title, The Confutation of xiii Articles, Whereunto Nicholas Shaxton, Late Bishop of Salisburye Subscribed. It was not a work dealing primarily with predestination, but rather concerned itself with thirteen different points of doctrine, with regard to each of which Crowley sought to confute the views of the Catholic Bishop of Salisbury, Nicholas Shaxton. The last point had to do with the freedom of the will, and it was within that context that the predestinarian passages assailed by Champneys were included.

Actually Crowley had very little to say about the doctrine at that point; and what he did say would appear not to have been overly significant. The following is probably the strongest passage of the treatment:

> These vessels of wrath shall not escape the vengence prepared, nor the vessels of mercy be confounded. God hath his number

---

[70] Martin, Les Protestants Anglais Réfugiés à Genève au Temps de Calvin, p. 273.

[71] Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 198.

> appointed, and their names written in the book of life, who be for certainly elect and chosen....It is not possible for them to be seduced, be they never so much tempted, stirred, and provoked.[72]

The reply which Crowley directed against Champneys' letter was published in 1566 under the title, An Apologie, or Defence, of Those Englishe Writers and Preachers Which Cerberus the Three Headed Dog of Hell, Chargeth with False Doctrine, Under the Name of Predestination. As is suggested by the title, Crowley was probably ignorant of the identity of his adversary. Obvious also from the title is Crowley's identification with Veron and the other Calvinist writers assailed by Champneys. Indeed, Crowley's defense set out to vindicate not only himself, but the rest of the Calvinist group as well.

Even more so than with Veron, however, Crowley's heaviest dependence was not at all upon Calvin, but rather upon Augustine. His work virtually turned upon the interpretation and elucidation of certain key passages from the early saint. It was to Augustine that he most frequently appealed and his works that he quoted the most, additional support only occasionally being drawn from the other early Fathers of the Church.

At one point, interestingly enough, Crowley discussed directly the relative authority of Calvin and Augustine on the matter of predestination; and on the basis of the criterion of antiquity he concluded that the works of Calvin could not legitimately even be compared with those of Augustine.[73] But even so, he was not beyond siding with the Genevan reformer against the Bishop of Hippo from time to time.[74] And apart from his unquestionable association with the Genevan doctrine and its exponents, he certainly drew upon Calvinist ideas more than his references alone would suggest.

---

[72] Robert Crowley, The Confutation of xiii Articles, Whereunto Nicholas Shaxton, Late Bishop of Salisburye Subscribed (London: John Day, [1548]), p. 3.

Crowley's technique in his defense was one (reminiscent of that of John Knox) of including his opponent's entire text within his own work. His apology took the form of a passage-by-passage commentary upon and rebuttal of Champneys' letter. Consequently it contained relatively little by way of positive doctrinal exposition.

On the positive side of predestination Crowley maintains that "there is an elected and chosen number of whom God hath given faith, and hath poured out love in their hearts, so that they may come unto Christ." "None can be of this number," he continues, "but those only to whom it is given freely without any manner deserving, either past, present, or to come."[75] God's election is dependent solely upon his good will and pleasure.

For Crowley it is not possible that any of the elect should finally fall. While the number and identity of the chosen remain unknown to men, they are known to God, who will not allow any of them to perish.[76]

---

[73] An Apologie, or Defence, of Those Englishe Writers and Preachers Which Cerberus the Three Headed Dog of Hell, Chargeth with False Doctrine, Under the Name of Predestination (London: Henry Binneman, 1566), fol. 25a.

[74] Ibid., fols. 25a-26b.

[75] Ibid., fols. 21b, 92b.

On the negative side of the doctrine, Crowley maintains that God's decree is also responsible for reprobation. Indeed, it was the effective cause of Adam's fall in the first place--an event which Crowley sees as "exceeding good," since it involved the execution of God's purposes.[77] The Atonement was not general, he adds, but applies only to the chosen and elect.[78]

God, however, is not to be thought of as the author and cause of sin.[79] When all other explanations and defenses have failed, there is always the convenient predestinarian refrain: "O thou man, who art thou, that darest take upon thee to reason with God?"[80]

Crowley's reply apparently brought to an end the controversy with Champneys, as no other publication by either side is known to have been issued. As for the overall significance of the controversy for the Calvinist offensive, its chief importance would seem to lie simply in its role as the context within which the first expressions of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination in the new period were put forward. While it would obviously be claiming too much to say that the dispute centered entirely around the Calvinist doctrine--as has already been pointed out, the greater dependence on the whole was certainly upon Augustine--nevertheless the strong Calvinist influences and associations present in the work of Veron and Crowley cannot be overlooked. Although the controversy may not have been as important in the long run as some of the later developments, the series of exchanges certainly laid the foundations for the subsequent advance of the doctrine in the period.

---

[76] *Ibid.*, fols. 11a, 21b.

[77] *Ibid.*, fols. 30a, 44a.

[78] *Ibid.*, fol. 98a.

[79] *Ibid.*, fols. 30a, 44a, 58b.

[80] *Ibid.*, fol. 92b.

The complete commitment of Puritan theology to the Calvinist doctrine of predestination in the early Elizabethan period was, as has already been suggested, certainly an important and constant source of support for its advance. The character and extent of this commitment are rather aptly illustrated by two confessions composed in the early 1570's by two of the chief leaders of the evolving Puritan movement, John Field and Thomas Wilcox. Co-authors of the important "Admonition to Parliament" of 1572, Field and Wilcox both exercised a constant and sometimes decisive influence upon Puritanism. Apart from their own works, both were vigorously involved in the translation of a number of continental Calvinist writings.[81]

Actually neither of the Field-Wilcox confessions saw formal publication in the sixteenth century, both documents having been preserved within broader collections of Puritan writings. Notwithstanding, because of their representative character the two confessions serve as excellent indicators of the general tone of Elizabethan Puritan thought. Both were general confessions of faith and covered the entire scope of Christian beliefs.

---

[81] _Cf._, _infra_, p. 202.

A couple of passages from one of these (probably composed in the same year as the other--1572) will suffice to illustrate the Calvinist character of the doctrine of predestination which they taught. The first passage was included in the section entitled, "Of Election and Reprobation"; the second, in that entitled "Of Justifying Faith."

> We acknowledge, that the Lord God hath (to the end he might thereby set forth his glory) chosen out of this general corruption some, whom freely for his own mercy's sake only, and that in Jesus Christ his son, he hath appointed, and that before the foundations of the world were laid, to be his heirs of eternal life and salvation: and that in his just judgement, he hath ordained the other to be the vessels of his wrath, and appointed them to perpetual death and condemnation. Now we confess that in the election of the one, and reprobation of the other, the Lord had not any consideration of their works, either past or to come: but that therein he only respected his own glory, and that his blessed will and good pleasure is the only cause of both.
>
> We believe that faith is the gift of God, which he worketh in us, inwardly by the power and effect of the holy ghost, and outwardly by the preaching of his word. And this faith we call a certain and an assured knowledge which the holy ghost of his own only grace and goodness doth from time to time increase in the hearts of the elect: by which knowledge it commeth to pass, that every one of them is fully and certainly in his own conscience persuaded of his election, and doth apply unto himself particularly the promise of salvation in Christ Jesus.[82]

---

[82] John Field, and Thomas Wilcox, "A Confession of Faith," A Parte of A Register, pp. 534-36. Concerning the other confession, cf., The Seconde Parte of a Register, I, 83-87.

More important yet for the advance of the Calvinist doctrine in the period were the Elizabethan revisions of and additions to the Genevan translation of the Bible. Reference has already been made to the tremendous popularity of the Geneva Bible in England in the second half of the sixteenth century.[83] Indeed, it would be difficult to overestimate the influence which the work exerted upon English religious thought. To it must certainly go a large share of the credit for the rapid spread of the Calvinist faith within the Elizabethan Church.[84]

The introduction of a revised New Testament and the insertion of a catechism on predestination in the 1570's and 1580's strongly reinforced the Calvinist predestinarian tendencies already present in the Geneva Bible. In 1576 Laurence Tomson, a Puritan divine of some note and reputation, brought out a new and revised edition of the Geneva New Testament. While the new revision was published only in separate editions for over a decade, from 1587 forward it replaced the original version in most editions of the Bible.[85]

If the text of Tomson's New Testament varied only slightly from that of the original Genevan version, the marginal annotations which were appended were all completely new. The notes were taken almost entirely from Theodore de Beza's Latin New Testament of 1565, and as one might expect they were thoroughly Calvinistic in tone. This was particularly the case with regard to those touching upon the doctrine of predestination.

---

[83] Cf., supra, p. 139.

[84] Charles Eason, The Genevan Bible; Notes on Its Production and Distribution (Dublin: Eason and Son, Ltd., 1937), p. 1.

[85] Ibid., pp. 5, 16; and Greenslade, "English Versions of the Bible, 1525-1611," The Cambridge History of the Bible, p. 158.

Two selected notes will serve to illustrate the sort of changes effected by Tomson's revision. Whereas in the original version the note to Romans ix, 15 had read, "As the only will and purpose of God is the chief cause of election and reprobation: so his free mercy in Christ is an inferior cause of salvation, and the hardening of the heart an inferior cause of damnation,"[86] the new note was as follows:

> He answereth first touching them which are chosen to salvation: in choosing of whom, he denieth that God may seem unjust, although he choose and predestinate to salvation, them that are not yet born, without any respect of worthiness: because he bringeth not the chosen to the appointed end, but by the means of his mercy, which is a cause next under predestination. Now mercy presupposeth misery, and again misery presupposeth sin or voluntary corruption of mankind, and corruption presupposeth a pure and perfect creation. Moreover mercy is showed by her degrees: to wit, by calling, by faith, by justification and sanctification, so that at length we come to glorification, as the Apostle will show afterward. Now all these things orderly following the purpose of God, do clearly prove that he can by no means seem unjust in loving and saving his.[87]

And whereas in the original version the note to Romans ix, 17 had read simply "Or God in Scripture," Tomson's new note was as follows:

---

[86] _Cf._, _supra_, p. 138.

[87] _The Bible; That Is, The Holy Scriptures Conteined in the Olde and Newe Testament, Translated According to the Ebrew and Greeke, and Conferred with the Best Translations in Divers Languages, with Most Profitable Annotations upon All the Hard Places and Other Things of Great Importance_ [Geneva Version] (London: Christopher Barker, 1587).

> Now he answereth concerning the reprobate, or them whom God hateth being not yet born, and hath appointed to destruction, without any respect of unworthiness. And first of all he proveth this to be true, by alleging the testimony of God himself touching Pharoa, whom he stirred up to this purpose, that he might be glorified in his hardening and just punishing.[88]

The insertion beginning in 1579 of a short catechism on predestination between the two Testaments of the quarto editions of the Bible strengthened even further its Calvinist flavor. Entitled "Certaine Questions and Answers Touching the Doctrine of Predestination, the Use of Gods Worde and Sacraments," the catechism was issued anonymously and without benefit of public authority.[89] Undoubtedly intended for private and family use, as the size of the volumes within which it was contained would suggest, the influence of the catechism in inculcating the Calvinist doctrine among the English masses must certainly have been great.

After declaring that the reason why "men so much vary in matters of religion" is "because they only believe the gospel and doctrine of Christ, which are ordained unto eternal life," the catechism goes on to explain that "some are vessels of wrath ordained unto destruction, as others are vessels of mercy prepared to glory." The elect know themselves as such by "the motions of spiritual life, which belongeth only to the children of God." God draws his chosen "by the preaching of his word and the ministering of his Sacraments thereunto annexed"--the former teaching by hearing, the latter by means of the other senses. It is not possible that the elect should fall, for God "repenteth not the gifts and graces of his adoption: neither does he cast off those, whom he hath once received."[90]

---

[88] Ibid.

[89] Strype hesitantly mentions "[Thomas] Cartwright, [Walter] Travers, or some other" as possible authors, while Basil Hall suggests that the catechism may have been derived from "some writings of Beza." Strype, Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign (New ed.; 4 vols. in 7; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1824), III, i, 226; and Basil Hall, "The Genevan Version of the English Bible," The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England, XI, No. 1 (May, 1956), 72.

As for the question "How standeth it with god's justice, that some are appointed unto damnation?" the catechism answers, "Very well: because all men have in themselves sin, which deserveth no less." God's mercy is indeed "wonderful" for choosing to elect any from among the "sinful race" that is mankind.[91]

Finally, the publication in English translation of a number of continental Calvinist writings on predestination would have to have been a significant factor in the advance of the doctrine in the early Elizabethan period. Beginning in the early 1560's, translations of several of the key writings in this regard were produced and widely circulated in England. The generous reception with which the works were met probably fits into the larger pattern of English dependence upon continental theological literature in general, but it certainly also is indicative of the extent to which the Puritans and other Elizabethan Calvinist groups were willing to rely upon and make use of the ready-made treatments of predestination available from aborad.

---

[90] _The Bible, Translated According to the Ebrew and Greeke, and Conferred with the Best Translations in Divers Languages, with Most Profitable Annotations upon All Hard Places and Other Things of Great Importance_ [Geneva Version] (London: Christopher Barker, 1579).

[91] _Ibid_.

As one might well expect, the works of Calvin himself stood in the forefront in this regard. Altogether something like eighty separate editions of Calvin's writings were published in Elizabethan England,[92] no other theological writer, English or foreign, having nearly so many publications. And of these, not a few either dealt specifically with or at least touched upon the doctrine of predestination.

As early as 1561 an English translation of the final edition (1559) of Calvin's theological masterpiece, his Institutes of the Christian Religion, made its appearance in London. Incorporating as it did an extensive statement of Calvin's final and mature opinion on predestination, the volume most certainly had a decisive impact upon English predestinarian thought. The work of Thomas Norton, an eminent Puritan lawyer and poet, the translation saw no fewer than eight further editions by the end of the sixteenth century. Its eventual adoption as an acknowledge theological text-book in the universities of England is indicative of the extent of the influence which it came to wield.

---

[92] Alfred W. Pollard, and Gilbert R. Redgrave, comps., A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640 (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1956), pp. 95-97.

In 1579 there followed an English translation of a collection of thirteen of Calvin's sermons which dealt specifically with election and reprobation. First published by Calvin as late as 1560, the sermons were translated under the title, *Thirteene Sermons of Maister John Calvine, Entreating of the Free Election of God in Jacob, and of Reprobation in Esau*. The sermons were translated by John Field, the Puritan writer already mentioned above.

In the dedicatory epistle to the translation, Field included a number of quite interesting comments and observations. For him, predestination is "the most comfortable doctrine that can be, being the foundation of all the rest." The translation therefore was directed against those who would oppose the doctrine--those "manifest heretics" who "bark so like Dogs against the everlasting predestination and election of God."[93] Calvin, Field believes, is clear and authoritative enough on the subject; but for those who would seek additional guidance, reference is made to a number of the English Calvinist writings already mentioned above in this and the preceding chapter:

> For further satisfaction in this question, I refer all Christians to the Books that are written hereof, and namely to these excellent Sermons: M. Knox hath learnedly answered the objections of the adversaries in a Book printed at Geneva. We have also home writers, that have dealt fully and plainly therein, as Veron of Predestination, and M. Crowley in his book against Cerberus, rightly so called for his barking blasphemies, against this most comfortable and

---

[93] Field, "The Epistle," *Thirteen Sermons of Maister John Calvine, Entreating of the Free Election of God in Jacob, and of Reprobation in Esau*, by Calvin, trans. Field (London: Thomas Dawson for Thomas Man and Tobie Cooke, 1579), [p. viii].

> excellent doctrine: others that are learned may further satisfy themselves, with those learned answers of M. Beza against that impure Apostate Castalio.[94]

The above passage is especially significant in that it would seem to confirm conclusively the association between the works of Knox, Veron, and Crowley and the English Calvinist offensive.

Finally, in 1583 an English translation of Calvin's commentary on the book of Romans also made its appearance in London. First published by Calvin in 1539, the work was translated by one Christopher Rosdell under the title, *A Commentary upon the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romanes*. And again, the work contained a rather important treatment of the doctrine of predestination.

In addition to the above, of course, any number of the other works of Calvin translated in this period dealt to some lesser degree with the doctrine. And if one is at first somewhat surprised that some of the other more predestinarian works of Calvin did not see English translations in this period, one must bear in mind that Calvin's writings were being widely read by Englishmen in their Latin and French versions as well, so that Calvin's influence was far from being confined merely to the English translations of his works.[95]

---

[94] *Ibid.*, [p. x].

[95] Hall, "Calvin Against the Calvinists," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, XX, No. 3 (1962), 300. Reference has already been made in this regard to the influence in an earlier period of Calvin's treatise, *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*--perhaps the strongest statement of his predestinarian views. *Cf.*, *supra*, p. 40.

After those of Calvin, the works of Theodore de Beza were the most important for the Calvinist predestinarian movement in England. As with Calvin, Beza also was widely read by Elizabethan Englishmen, something over forty separate editions of his various works seeing publication during the period.[96] And in a number of those Beza was led to expound upon the doctrine of predestination and related topics, on which points he was one of the ablest defenders of the Calvinist position, going even further if anything than Calvin himself.[97]

Reference has already been made in the preceding chapter to the Elizabethan translation by John Stockwood of Beza's _Treasure of Trueth_.[98] The translation received two editions, seeing publication in 1576 and 1581.

In addition, two other more general theological works of Beza, each of which dealt in part with predestination, saw English translations and numerous editions in the period. Under the title, _A Briefe and Piththie Summe of the Christian Faith, Made in Forme of a Confession, with a Confutation of All Suche Superstitious Errours, as Are Contrary Thereunto_, a Robert Fyll translated and published one of Beza's more important theological works. First put forward by Beza in 1555, the treatise first appeared in English probably in 1565, but the translation saw four further editions by 1589. And in 1572 Arthur

---

[96] Pollard, and Redgrave, comps., _A Short-Title Catalogue_, pp. 45-46.

[97] Henry Martyn Baird, _Theodore Beza, the Counsellor of the French Reformation, 1519-1605_ (Heroes of the Reformation series; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899), p. 268.

[98] _Cf._, _supra_, pp. 140-41.

Golding, a Puritan writer and probably the most voluminous translator of the era, published a translation of another of Beza's works under the title, A Booke of Christian Questions and Answers, Wherein Are Set Forth the Cheef Points of the Christian Religion in Manner of an Abridgement. It had first been published by Beza in 1570; it saw five further English editions by 1586.

Finally, an important theological writing by Wolfgang Musculus, the Reformed theologian of Bern, also saw publication in the period. Englished by John Man, one of the chaplains to Archbishop Parker, under the title, Commonplaces of Christian Religion, Gathered by Wolfgangus Musculus, for the Use of Suche as Desire the Knowledge of Godly Truthe, the translation was first published in 1563 and then again in 1578. Originally put forward by Musculus in 1554, the work contained a somewhat lengthy and thoroughly Calvinistic section on election and reprobation.

Thus the evidence would seem to indicate that during the early Elizabethan period the Calvinist doctrine of predestination was taking firm root in the soil of English theology. The widespread circulation of the doctrine in the period could only mean that increasing numbers of Englishmen were being led to accept the views of the Genevan reformer. It would probably not be claiming too much therefore to say that by the middle of Elizabeth's reign the Calvinist tradition had established itself as an effective and operative alternative to other more moderate predestinarian views.

## Rise of the Anti-Calvinist Tradition

Probably the best indication of the growing strength of Calvinist predestinarian ideas in the early Elizabethan Church was the development during the same period of a distinctly anti-Calvinist tradition of thought. From the very earliest phases of the Calvinist offensive, opposition tendencies began to make themselves heard. Along with the continued advance of the Calvinist doctrine, the evolution of such tendencies would certainly have to rank as one of the important overall developments of the period.

It is probably too much, however, to speak of these tendencies in terms of a true party or movement. What the period witnessed in this regard was not so much a unified effort or endeavor as the independent activity of an otherwise quite diverse group of churchmen and writers. What was shared in common by each of these individuals was the desire to raise a loud voice of protest and dissent against what was taken to be the threat of a Calvinist take-over of the English Church and its thought.

As for the background of the group, some of the figures, and especially John Champneys, are known to have had definite associations with the Freewill movement. For the most part, however, the group was much more closely akin to the moderate tradition in English thought. What gave the tendency all the more importance and significance was the fact that within its ranks were included more than one of the outstanding churchmen and thinkers of the day.

In the Elizabethan period, the work of John Champneys probably represents the earliest evidence of the circulation of these anti-Calvinist tendencies. The certain author of the anonymously written letter which figured so significantly in the early Elizabethan controversy on predestination,[99] Champneys had been known as an ardent if somewhat controversial reformer as early as the reign of Edward VI. In 1548 he had published a highly controversial tract under the title, *The Harvest Is at Hand, Wherein the Tares Shall Be Bound, and Cast into the Fyre and Brent*. In this he had advanced a number of rather dubious doctrinal opinions, some of which, interestingly enough, had bordered rather closely upon certain Calvinist positions. Soon thereafter he had been called before Archbishop Cranmer and certain other high prelates, where he had been required to abjure his heretical teachings and the following Sunday to bear a faggot on his shoulders at Paul's Cross.[100] Among the opinions attributed to him were, "that a man, after he is regenerate in Christ, cannot sin," and "that God doth permit to all his elect people their bodily necessities of all earthly things."[101]

---

[99] *Cf.*, *supra*, p. 189.

[100] Veron, *A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination and of the Divine Providence of God, with an Apology of the Same*, fol. 16a; Strype, *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer*, I, 254-55; Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, III, 39-40; and Millar Maclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642* (University of Toronto Department of English, Studies and Texts, No. 6; Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1958), pp. 48, 193.

[101] Strype, *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer*, I, 254-55.

Beyond this not much else is known about Champneys' early career. He seems to have fled to the continent during the reign of Mary and to have returned to England with the other exiles upon the accession of Elizabeth; but nothing in detail is known of his activities while abroad.[102]

As for Champneys' connection with the controversial letter mentioned above, John Veron, in the apology which he directed against the work, definitely linked the two together.[103] Apparently circulating originally as an unlicensed pamphlet, the letter was first printed in 1566 when Robert Crowley included it within the text of his reply. Later, in 1631, it saw publication again when, along with selections from the writings of John Hooper and Hugh Latimer, it was included by an "Arminian" editor in a highly controversial tract directed against the Calvinists.[104] Within the latter work the letter bore the rather lengthy title, "An Answere upon a Certaine Letter; Wherein the Answerer Purgeth Himselfe, and Others, from Pelagius Errours, and from the Errour of Free-Will, or Justification of Works; Wherewithal He Seemeth To Be Charged, by the Said Letter: and Further, He Sheweth Wherein, He Differeth in Judgement, from Certaine English

---

[102] Peter Heylyn, _Ecclesia Restaurata; or, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England_, ed. James Craigie Robertson (The Ecclesiastical History Society publications; 2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1849), I, 153.

[103] Veron, _A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination and of the Divine Providence of God, with an Apology of the Same_, fol. 17a.

[104] _Cf._, _supra_, p. 49, n. 45.

Writers and Preachers, Whom He Chargeth with Teaching of False Doctrine, Under the Name of Predestination."[105]

In the letter itself, which at times becomes not a little confused, Champneys purports to be answering a prior letter in which some unidentified adversary had charged both him and his associates with holding and teaching the errors of the notorious heretic Pelagius. Denying the charges categorically, Champneys seizes the opportunity to deal generally with the doctrine of predestination and its related implications. More specifically, he sets out "to show what shameful Doctrine (under the Name and color of God's Predestination) is Now-a-days set forth and taught by Many."[106]

In the first part of the letter-treatise Champneys was concerned to disassociate himself point by point with the principal doctrines of the Pelagian system. Altogether he lists eleven "errors" of Pelagius' teachings. Of these he writes: "O Blasphemy Intolerable! O Filthy Puddle! and Sink most Execrable! full of stinking Errors; full of Damnable Presumption; like to the Pride of Lucifer, most Abominable."[107] What Champneys seeks to do then is to develop, claiming the support of Augustine, something of a middle position on predestination--one calculated to avoid the "Doating Dreams of Destiny" on the one hand, and the "Absolute Free Will of Papistry" on the other.[108]

---

[105] *An Historical Narration of the Judgement of Some Most Learned and Godly English Bishops, Holy Martyrs, and Others, Concerning God's Election, and the Merit of Christ His Death*, pp. 1-66.

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[107] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

In the second part of the work Champneys moves on to point out certain elements of the predestinarian doctrine then being taught by many which he feels are needful of reproof. This he does by way of commenting upon certain selected passages from among recently published English books dealing with the subject. The list of these works, significantly is virtually identical with a list of the Calvinist and semi-Calvinist predestinarian writings of the Marian and early Elizabethan periods.

Champneys' first reference is to Crowley's Edwardian work, _The Confutation of xiii Articles_, which he cites in several different contexts. Two of John Knox's writings--his _Answer to a Great Nomber of Blasphemous Cavillations_ and his _First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women_, the latter a political tract directed against Queen Mary--come up for criticism and condemnation. And Anthony Gilby's _Brief Treatise of Election and Reprobation_ is referred to, by title only, in equally unfavorable terms.[109]

Beyond these, William Whittingham's translation of Theodore de Beza's _Brief Declaration of the Chief Points of Christian Religion_ is mentioned, as is Bartholomew Traheron's "Against a Privie Papist," both again by title only. And finally, the glosses in "the last

---

[108] _Ibid_., pp. 13-14.

[109] _Ibid_., pp. 18, 22, 24, 32, 43, 46.

Translated Bible"--an obvious reference to the Geneva Bible--are likewise attacked and condemned.[110]

Champneys' criticism of these writings centers especially upon two points: what he sees as an implication of their teaching to the effect that God is the cause and author of sin, and their view that sin is not the cause of man's reprobation. The first of these is for him the "most odious and horrible"--a "miserable absurdity."[111] "Neither the falls of them that fall," he writes against the view, quoting Augustine, "nor the wickedness of them that be wicked, nor the lust of them that offend, hath the predestination of God either provoked, moved, or compelled."[112] "For if Murderers, Adulterers, Thieves, Traitors, and Rebels," he continues, "be of God Predestinate and Appointed to be Wicked,...and cannot choose, but of mere Necessity, by the Ordinance of God, commit all such wickedness, even as they do: Then, what is our life, but a mere Destiny? All our Doings, God's ordinances; and all our Imaginations, Branches of God's Predestination?"[113]

Against the second point Champneys writes: "For as God's Hatred, and Vengeance hath ever Relation to Man's ill-deserving: So hath God's Love, and Mercy never any relation to Man's merit." "The hatred of God, and Everlasting damnation are Just rewards of Man's

---

[110] *Ibid*., pp. 36, 41, 44, 63.

[111] *Ibid*., pp. 40, 48.

[112] *Ibid*., p. 20.

[113] *Ibid*., p. 26.

Evil-deserving," sin being "the very grounded cause, why God hateth, taketh vengeance, and punisheth man."[114]

Finally, what is perhaps just as significant in Champneys' work is the association which he makes between his own position and that of the early Church Fathers, including Augustine; Philip Melanchthon, "the chiefest, and best learned of all the Germans"; Heinrich Bullinger, "the chiefest, and most excellent of all the Switzers"; and Erasmus Sacerius.[115]

Of a somewhat different spirit than Champneys must have been one Thomas Talbot, parson of St. Mary Magdalene Church in London during the early Elizabethan period. Talbot seems to have been the leader, or at least the spokesman, of a considerable group of non-Calvinist Anglicans. "Differing from the rest...in the point of predestination," the group apparently took a great deal of criticism and abuse from the Calvinists during the first years of Elizabeth.[116]

Within this context Talbot addressed an urgent petition around 1562 to the bishops and other prelates of the church requesting relief and liberty of conscience for himself and his brethren. The text of the petition has been preserved intact by Strype; and since the document provides a number of valuable and useful insights into the character and spirit of the anti-Calvinist tradition, it would seem worthwhile quoting somewhat extensively from it. The petition therefore is as follows:

---

[114] *Ibid.*, pp. 59, 60, 61.

[115] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[116] Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, I, i, 494.

> Whereas there be many, both of the clergy and laity, of this realm of England, that do fear God, and hate and abhor all papistry and foreign power, which the pope in times past usurped within the realm, under the pretence of God's right, and have for the same, in the reign of the queen's majesty's noble sister, queen Mary, suffered exile, imprisonment, and great penury, with other loss of friends and goods, as other protestants have done; and now look and hope to enjoy, together with the rest of the queen's majesty's obedient subjects, the good and merciful benefit of God given unto this realm under the queen's majesty's most noble and prosperous reign, that is to say, quietness of conscience, not being compelled to any idolatry, or false serving of God, and a quiet time by God's grace to frame their lives according to their profession:
>
> Yet notwithstanding, contrary to their expectation, to their great grief and sorrow, because they do hold, contrary to a great number of their brethren the protestants, that God's holy predestination is no manner of occasion or cause at all in anywise of the wickedness, iniquity, or sin, that ever was, is, or ever shall be wrought, committed, or done in the world, whereby any part of mankind shall be predestinate, of any unavoidable necessity, to commit and perpetrate the sin and wickedness that mankind, or any part of mankind, from the beginning hath or shall commit or perpetrate; and so to be ordained before all worlds, by force of God's holy predestination, to an unavoidable necessity to be damned eternally:
>
> That if God should predestinate from everlasting any of the aforesaid evil, wickedness, and sin, to be committed, done, and perpetrated of an inevitable necessity, that then God, through his predestination, were the chief author and occasion thereof; and also an example thereof unto the world world, which by his commandment is bound to follow his example, and be holy as he is holy:
>
> That God doth foreknow and predestinate all good and goodness, but doth any foreknow, and not predestinate, any evil, wickedness, or sin, in any behalf; which thing all the learned fathers unto this our age have always most firmly holden and maintained, and a great many of the learned of this our age yet do firmly hold and maintain.
>
> For this cause they be esteemed and taken of their brethren the protestants for fautors of false religion, and are constrained hitherto to sustain at their hands daily the shameful reproach and infamy of free-will men, Pelagians, papists,

epicures, anabaptists, and enemies unto God's holy predestination and providence, with other such like approbrious words and threatenings of such like, or as great punishments and corrections, as upon any of the aforesaid errors and sects is meet and due to be executed, what time discipline (which of all things is most meet and necessary to be had in a Christian congregation) shall be fully committed into the hands of the clergy. Whereas nevertheless they hold no such things as they are burdened withal, but do only hold concerning predestination as above briefly is declared. Which thing they be ready at all times, and have many times offered unto divers of their foresaid brethren, the protestants and learned, (for avoiding of contentions, brawlings, ambiguities, misplacing and misunderstanding of words, which may fall in so high and weighty a matter,) to maintain and prove by disputation in writing, that they justly, and according to God's word, do hold and may hold the same, without any prejudice or suspicion to be had towards them of the opprobrious infamy of such heretical names abovenamed; and do nothing doubt at all, but by such kind of conference and disputation in writing, by the grace of God, to make this so high and weighty a matter, (which is not well possible by argumentation with tongue and words directly to be expressed,) most clear and evident to be judged, discerned, and understanded of all men.

Please it your gracious fatherhoods therefore, that it may be provided and enacted, that none of those corrections, punishments, and executions, which the clergy hath in their authority already, and hereafter by authority of this present parliament from henceforth shall have in their authority, to exercise upon any of the aforesaid errors and sects, or any other, shall in no wise extend to be executed upon any manner of person or persons as do hold of predestination as is above declared; except it be duly proved that the same person or persons do, by their express words or writings, affirm and maintain, that man of his own natural power is able to think, will, or work of himself any thing, that should in any case help or serve towards his own salvation, or any part thereof, or else some other manifest articles or points of error, which any of the foresaid sects, or any other, do hold.

That other their brethren, and learned protestants, that do not hold of predestination as is abovesaid, shall from henceforth cease, desist, and leave off from calling any man by the name of free-will man, Pelagian, papist, epicure, anabaptist, or any other heretical name, contrary to the order of charity; except the party whom they so call be convict of the same by order of the law.

That all disputation concerning God's holy predestination shall be from henceforth had and made only by writing, and not

> by word of mouth, for the avoiding of all unreverend speaking of God's holy predestination; and to avoid all contention and brawling, and other uncharitable behaviour, which of such unreverend speaking must needs proceed and come.
>
> That from henceforth it shall be lawful for both parts, as well them that hold of predestination as is abovesaid, as the other, freely to write and put in print whatsoever they shall be able to allege and bring in, for the maintenance and proving of the truth of their opinion. Whereby all men may be able to judge and discern the truth betwixt both parties, and brotherly charity be observed and kept among such as do profess God's word, hate all papistry, and be true and obedient subjects unto the queen's majesty, to the good example of all the rest of the people, both within this realm and without. God save the queen. Amen.[117]

One can conclude from this document that not all the anti-Calvinists were stamped in the controversial mold of Champneys. There must have been many others like Talbot who wanted simply to be left in peace with their own opinions.

The ranks of the anti-Calvinist forces during the period were also bolstered by the work of two very able foreign-born theologians, each of whom had found religious refuge in England and was ultimately to rise to positions of pre-eminence within the Elizabethan Church. Antonio de Corro, a Spaniard, and Peter Baro, a Frenchman, were both avowed anti-Calvinists on the point of predestination; and each gave himself with energy and eloquence to the task of countering the spread of the Calvinist doctrine in the early Elizabethan period.

A sometime monk of Seville, Antonio de Corro had spent two decades wandering among the Reformed communities of Switzerland, France, and the Low Countries following his flight from Spain in 1547. Taking refuge in England in 1567, he soon became associated with the various congregations of the Strangers' Church in London. For a while he even served as pastor of the Spanish branch of that church.

---

[117] Quoted in ibid., pp. 495-98.

Within a very short time, however, Corro found himself involved in a serious doctrinal dispute with his French and Italian counterparts over the content and character of his preaching. Charged generally with leaning too much toward the views of Pelagius, Corro had as a matter of fact begun to deviate significantly from the orthodox Calvinist position, especially in certain lectures which touched heavily upon predestination and other related themes.

As if to confirm the suspicions of the Calvinists, Corro published in 1569 the essence of his earlier sermons and lectures in the form of a theological broadsheet. Entitled _Tableau de l'oeuvre de Dieu_, the publication saw three further editions by 1584. Definitely anti-Calvinist in tone, the work characterizes God as a Being in whom mercy, clemency, and kindness predominate. He is said to love rather than hate his creatures, offering salvation to all who will accept it by faith. Election therefore comes to be identified simply with the process by which all men appropriate the benefits of Christ freely offered to all. The Calvinists are accused of repeating a predestinarian formula which they neither believe nor understand.[118]

---

[118] William McFadden, "The Life and Works of Antonio del Corro (1527-1591)" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Queen's University, Belfast, Ireland, 1953), pp. 349, 365, 614, 620.

The end result of the dispute was that Corro was finally suspended from preaching among the refugees in London. Whereupon he detached himself permanently from the Strangers' Church and subsequently pursued a career within the Church of England.

In 1571 Corro secured appointment to the important and influential position of Latin Reader in Divinity at the Temple Church in London, a post which he held for some seven years thereafter. But once again, it was not long before he was in trouble anew with the Calvinists. In the course of a series of lectures on the Pauline Epistle to the Romans, Corro was led once again to affirm his anti-Calvinist views on predestination. These views offended and were disputed by Richard Alvey, the Master of the Temple, who was a staunch Calvinist.

Something of the flavor of Corro's Temple lectures is suggested in a short passage included in a letter of 1571 which William Barlow addressed to a friend in Zurich. "He is wont to disparage the authority," Barlow wrote, "of some individuals who have deserved exceedingly well of the church: he is a great admirer of Castalio.... I was present at an excellent lecture of his, in which he inveighed against the men of our age, some of whom wish to be called Lutherans, others Calvinists, Etc., though neither Calvin nor Luther died for us."[119]

---

[119] Robinson, ed., The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with Some of the Helvetian Reformers During the Early Part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (The Parker Society Publications; 2 pts.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1842, 1846), pp. 261-62.

Master Alvey was finally forced to complain to Archbishop Parker concerning the matter, accusing Corro, as Parker later related, of "affirming free will, and speaking not wisely of predestination."[120]

In 1574 Corro again made his views public when he brought together his Temple lectures and published them at London in the form of a theological dialogue. The initial Latin edition of the publication was followed in 1575 by the first of several English editions, which bore the title, *A Theological Dialogue, Wherein the Epistle of S. Paul the Apostle to the Romanes Is Expounded*. And what made the work especially important was that to it Corro appended a somewhat lengthy confession of faith which covered his views on all the principal points of theology, including predestination.

While the doctrine of predestination was touched upon within the dialogue proper, the treatment in the final article of the appended confession was not only more complete, but more systematic in approach as well. And again, a basically anti-Calvinist doctrine was set forth. While Corro maintains that "God from everlasting hath freely of his own mere goodness without any respect of men, predestinated or chosen the Saints whom he intendeth to save," and that such election "be not for any desert of ours," nevertheless the emphasis is definitely placed upon the goodness of God toward man.[121] Although the Scriptures do speak of "the fewness of the chosen," yet Christians are to "hope well of all men, and not to be rash in reckening any man to be a reprobate;" for it is clearly the meaning of the Gospel that "if we believe and be in Jesus Christ, we be chosen."[122] "In the temptation of predestination," he continues, "than the which there is not a more dangerous, let this be our comfort, that God's promises are universal to all believers: that he saith, ask and ye shall receive, for every one that asketh receiveth."[123] Christ, therefore, must be our "looking-glass wherein to behold our predestination." "We have evident and substantial record enough, that we be written in the book of life," he concludes, "if we communicate with Christ, so that he be ours and we be his through true faith."[124]

---

[120] Matthew Parker, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. John Bruce (The Parker Society Publications; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1853), p. 476.

[121] Antonio de Corro, *A Theological Dialogue, Wherein the Epistle of S. Paul the Apostle to the Romanes Is Expounded* (London: Thomas Purfoote, 1575), fols. 152b, 154a.

From the Temple Corro moved to the University of Oxford, where he became a lecturer in theology in association with Christ Church College. He was succeeded at his former post by Lawrence Chaderton and later Walter Travers, both Puritan divines and staunch Calvinists. The latter was to pay Corro the compliment of labeling him the spiritual predecessor of Richard Hooker, the eminent Anglican apologist who also was to be associated with the Temple and with whom Travers was to dispute over matters of predestination in the 1580's.[125]

---

[122] Ibid., fols. 153a, 154a.

[123] Ibid., fol. 154b.

[124] Ibid.

[125] Cf., infra, pp. 230-33.

Late in life Corro was made a prebendary of St. Paul's Church in London. In 1591 he died--"a man of good learning" as Strype puts it, but "of an hasty and somewhat contentious spirit."[126]

Peter Baro, a close friend and associate of Corro, had also retired to England as a religious refugee, in 1572. A Frenchman by birth, he had received ordination at the hands of Calvin himself at Geneva in 1560. Forced out of his native country by religious troubles, he eventually settled at the University of Cambridge, where in 1574 he assumed the duties of Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity.

His early associations with Geneva notwithstanding, soon after his arrival at Cambridge Baro too began to emerge as a definite critic of the more rigid aspects of Calvinist predestinarian theology. In a series of lectures on the prophet Jonah (later published in 1579) he ventured to maintain, from the history of the Ninevites, that "it is the will of God we should have eternal life, if we believe and persevere in the faith of Christ; but if we do not believe, or believing only for a time, do not persevere, then it is not the will of God we should be saved."[127] And in a disputation on the theme, "God's purpose and decree taketh not away the liberty of man's corrupt will," he concluded that

---

[126] Strype, The History of the Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund Grindal, p. 185.

[127] Peter Baro, Petri Baronis, Stempani, Sacrae Theologiae in Academia Cantabrigiensi Doctoris ac Professoris in Jonam Prophetam Praelectiones (London: John Day, 1579), p. 217. "Dei voluntas est, ut vitam habeamus, sí credamus: & Dei voluntas non est, ut vitam habeamus, nisí credamus: aut, sí credentes perseveremus."

> God the creator and governor of all things is not the destroyer of the order by him appointed, but the preserver. For he would that in the nature of things there should be divers and sundry causes, namely some necessary, and othersame also free and contingent: which, according to their several natures, might work freely and contingently, or not work. Whereupon we conclude, that secondary causes are not enforced by God's purpose and decree, but carried willingly and after their own nature: for because that God is the preserver of the order by him set and appointed, and not the destroyer: who worketh by Satan and the wicked, not as by a stone or brute beast: but according to the quality and disposition of that nature which he hath put in them.[128]

Despite his great personal popularity among the students, the expression of such views soon led to complaints on the part of Baro's Calvinist colleagues. In 1581 Lawrence Chaderton, to be Corro's successor at the Temple and later master of Emmanuel College, preached publicly against Baro's teachings; and some time thereafter Robert Some likewise took exception with Baro's views.[129] But in both instances the differences were amicably resolved, at least for the time being.

In the following decade, however, Baro's good fortune would appear to have abandoned him somewhat. Toward the middle of the 1590's he became involved in yet another controversy with the Calvinists at Cambridge, the scope and seriousness of which were far greater than with the earlier disputes. And while the details of the controversy as such lie beyond the scope of this study,[130] there are nevertheless a couple of references which are important for the present context as well. In 1596 Baro produced two statements on predestination, which, although they come a bit late, are nevertheless useful for understanding more fully the character of the doctrine taught during his earlier years.

---

[128] "Fower Sermons and Two Questions, as They Were Uttered and Disputed ad Clerum in S. Maries Church and Schools in Cambridge," appended to A Speciall Treatise of Gods Providence and of Comforts Against All Kinde of Crosses and Calamities To Be Fetched from the Same, by Andreas Gerardus, trans. J[ohn] L[udham] (London: John Woolfe, [1588?]), pp.519-20.

[129] Strype, Annals of the Reformation, III, i, 68.

On January 12, 1596, Baro preached a sermon *ad clerum* at St. Mary's Church, Cambridge, in which he dealt with certain problems related to predestination. According to Strype's summary of the sermon, Baro made three basic assertions:

> That God created all men according to his own likeness in Adam: and so consequently to eternal life. From which he chased no man, unless because of sin.
>
> That Christ died sufficiently for all.
>
> That the promises of God made to us, as they are generally propounded to us, were to be generally [i.e., universally] understood, as it is set down in the seventeenth article.[131]

Quite understandable, Baro's sermon gave offense to the Cambridge Calvinists. And although formal proceedings against him by university authorities never got very far, Baro found his situation at Cambridge thereafter so unpleasant that he chose to give up his professorship the same year.

---

[130] *Cf.*, *infra*, pp. 244-46.

[131] Strype, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D., The Third and Last Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (3 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822), II, 290.

On the occasion of his retirement, however, Baro prepared one final exposition of the doctrine, to which he gave the title, "Summa Trium de Praedestinatione Sententiarum."[132] In this short essay, in which his anti-Calvinist opinions were the most clearly expressed, Baro set out to summarize and evaluate the three basic positions on predestination then current among Protestants.

The first opinion Baro characterizes as being one of unconditional election and reprobation. It holds that God in electing and reprobating men from all eternity did so absolutely, "without respect to anything out of himself, but solely because thus it pleased him to display his own glory." In making his decrees, God "had no regard whatever either to Christ the Mediator or to faith," or "to any kind of sin either original or actual."[133] According to Baro this was the view of Calvin and Beza, as well as the mature opinion of Augustine and Luther. Holding such a view, Baro comments, "it is scarcely (and not even scarcely,) possible to understand how God may not be accounted the Author of that which is evil as well as that which is good."[134]

The second opinion differs from the first in that election and reprobation are dated only from the Fall, and in that the "material cause" of these is said to properly lie in Christ and in sin respectively.[135] But, as Baro points out, when "much pressed," the supporters of this view "must of necessity have recourse to that absolute will which it is their study to avoid"; so that in the final analysis, the differences between the first two views are not so great.[136] This second view according to Baro was the view of Augustine late in life, as well as of a number of Protestants.

---

[132] James Nichols has included a translation of Baro's treatise in his edition of The Works of James Arminius, D.D., Formerly Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden (3 vols.; London: for Longman, et al., 1825-1875).

[133] Included in The Works of James Arminius, I, 93.

[134] Ibid.

Summarizing these two views on predestination Baro writes as follows:

> I repeat it therefore, that two of these opinions rest on the foundation,--"that God, by an immutable and irrevocable decree, has, without any reference to sin, but by his own absolute will which no man is able to resist, determined within himself from all eternity to reprobate by far the largest portion of the human race, and (according to the first opinion,) to create them for eternal destruction, or (according to the second,) to desert them from the time when Adam sinned; that some of those who are of the number of the reprobate are every day necessarily and inevitably coming into existence and perishing,--they being persons to whom God has never vouchsafed his grace; or, if in his word or sacraments, he makes an offer of it to some of them, as to those who have some connection with the Church of God, such an offer is not made by him with seriousness as though they should be saved by that grace, but, on the contrary, it is made that they may be rendered less excusable, and may at last be more grievously punished; that the advent and the death of Christ have not been undertaken on their account; and that the benefits of his death have no more reference to men of this description, than to stones, brutes, or even devils themselves, because they have been from all eternity reprobated by God and purposely created, or (which bears the same import,) have been left in a lost mass, that they might be consigned to eternal destruction."[137]

---

[135] Ibid., pp. 94, 95.

[136] Ibid., p. 95.

[137] Ibid., p. 99.

Such views Baro labels "as a falsehood, and contrary both to the Sacred Scriptures and to the goodness of God."[138]

It is with the third and final opinion that Baro associates himself, along with Augustine before the Pelagian controversy and Philip Melanchthon in his own day. This is a view which maintains simply that "Whosoever believeth in Christ, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be dammed."[139] God "truly calls and invites ALL MEN, without any definition, to repentance, faith and salvation," Baro writes; wherefore He "has predestinated such as he from all eternity foreknew would believe on Christ,...that they might be made conformable to him in glory. But he hath likewise from all eternity reprobated all rebels, and such as contumaciously continue in sin, as persons unfit for his kingdom."[140] Again, God "never has hated or purposed to hate anyone in reference to his being a man formed by him, but only in reference to his being a sinner. On the contrary, he has promised and sent Christ to all those who have fallen in Adam and are sinners."[141]

Finally, it is at this point that Baro draws a distinction between the "antecendent will of God" and the "consequent will of God." By the former He wills that all should be saved; whereas by the latter some are dammed, but only "through their own perverseness and depravity."[142]

---

[138] Ibid.

[139] Ibid., p. 96.

[140] Ibid.

[141] Ibid., p. 98.

With this anti-Calvinist manifesto Baro quietly retired from the field of active controversy. Having moved to London, he died in 1599.

Finally, the anti-Calvinist forces counted among their ranks two domestic churchmen of even greater prominence and prestige. Samuel Harsnett, ultimately Archbishop of York, and Richard Hooker, apologist *par excellence* of the Anglican theological tradition, were second to none in the period in their opposition to the Calvinist doctrine. And the support of these men (and especially the latter) lent no small degree of respectability to the anti-Calvinist tradition.

Technically Samuel Harsnett was as much a seventeenth- as he was a sixteenth-century figure. It was only after the turn of the century that his rapid rise through the ranks of the Church of England began. He served successively as Bishop of Chichester and Norwich and Archbishop of York.

Harsnett's life-long anti-Calvinist tendencies, however, were already evident as early as the 1580's. Indeed, his chief association with the anti-Calvinist tradition in the early Elizabethan period revolved around a sermon which he preached at Paul's Cross in London on October 27, 1584. Although a mere twenty-three years of age at the time, Harsnett with complete confidence and poise arrayed himself against the more extreme predestinarian elements of the "Calvinian Gospel."

---

[142] *Ibid.*

Taking as his text Ezekiel xxxiii, 11 ("As I live, saith the Lord, I delight not in the death of the wicked"), Harsnett barred no holds in his attack upon the "Genevian conceit":

> There is a conceit in the world (beloved) [which] speaks little better of our gracious God than this:...That God should design many thousands of souls to Hell before they were, not in eye to their faults, but to his own absolute will and power, and to get him glory in their damnation. This opinion is grown hugh and monstrous (like a Goliah) and men do shake and tremble at it; yet never a man reacheth to David's sling to cast it down. In the name of the Lord of Hosts: we will encounter it; for it hath reviled, not the Host of the living God, but the Lord of Hosts.[143]

For Harsnett such Calvinist views as that "not one or two, but millions of men" must "fry in Hell...for no other cause, but his [God's] mere pleasure's sake," are but glorious phansies" and "Imaginations." They are "far from the nature of our Gracious, Merciful, and Glorious God," who "cannot hate any man, but for sin."[144] "The spirit of Peter (a great deal wiser than that of Geneva) saith plainly," he continues, that "God would not have any one to perish." "Since it hath pleased Almighty God there to say it," he concludes, "...I trust, we shall have grace to believe him; since himself can better tell what himself would have, than the man of Geneva can."[145]

---

[143] Samuel Harsnett, "A Sermon Preached at S. Pauls Cross in London," appended to *Three Sermons by Dr. Richard Stewart, Dean of St. Paul's*, by Richard Stewart (2nd ed.; London: for Gabriel Bedel and T. Collins, 1648), pp. 121, 133-34.

[144] *Ibid.*, pp. 134, 141, 151.

[145] *Ibid.*, pp. 153-54.

Summing up his views on the matter toward the end of the sermon, Harsnett makes the following clearly anti-Calvinist assertions:

1. God's absolute will is not the cause of Reprobation, but sin.
2. No man is of an absolute necessity the child of Hell, so as by God's Grace, he may not avoid it.
3. God simply willeth and wisheth every living Soul to be saved, and to come to the Kingdom of Heaven.
4. God sent his Son to save every Soul, and to bring it to the Kingdom of Heaven.
5. God's Son offereth Grace effectually to save every one, and to direct him to the Kingdom of Heaven.
6. The neglect and contempt of his Grace is the cause why every one doth not come to Heaven, and not any privative Decree, Counsel, or determination of God.[146]

As might be expected Harsnett was censured for his sermon by Archbishop Whitgift, and was forbidden to preach on the subject any more. The damage, however, had already been done, for the content of the sermon was rather widely circulated through the church, where it created no little theological stir.

Cast in a somewhat different mold was Richard Hooker, without question the most eminent Anglican theologian of the period. A quiet, retiring scholar, Hooker's influence was based not so much on the high position in the church which he held, as on his theological writing, the impact of which was (and has continued to be) both extensive and enduring.

Hooker's relationship with the anti-Calvinist tradition was of a somewhat different, and perhaps less direct, nature than that of the other individuals considered. He was never really an active anti-Calvinist propagandist in the sense that the others were; and certainly his differences with the Calvinists were both fewer and less significant in character. Rather Hooker's connection with the tradition was more by way of his being drawn, somewhat involuntarily, into controversy by the opposition which the Calvinists mounted against his otherwise rather moderate predestinarian views. Indeed, except for his clashes with the Calvinists, Hooker might well have been considered more properly among the other moderate churchmen of the period.

---

[146] _Ibid_., pp. 148-49.

Interestingly enough, the occasion of Hooker's first clash with the Calvinists was, as with Harsnett, a sermon preached at Paul's Cross. In 1581, three years before Harsnett's controversial presentation, Hooker touched upon predestination and related points in a sermon which he delivered there in the presence of John Almer, then Bishop of London. Although the sermon itself has not survived, something of its content is known.

According to Isaac Walton, Hooker's biographer, Hooker contradicted in his sermon Calvin's belief in the unity and oneness of God's will, maintaining rather that there are in God two wills--"an antecedent, and a consequent will." As Baro was later to do, Hooker asserted that God's first will was "that all mankind should be saved"; while his second will was "that those only should be saved that did live answerable to that degree of grace which he had offered, or afforded them."[147] In a later context Hooker was to spell this out more completely when he wrote that God's "general will...is that all men may enjoy the full perfection of that happiness which is their end," God longing "for nothing more than that all men might be saved"; but this first will not always being satisfied, due to "a personal impediment making particular men unable of that good which the will of his general providence did ordain for mankind,...from God, as it were by a secondary kind of will, there groweth now destruction and death, although otherwise the will of his voluntary inclination towards man would effect the contrary." "The determination of God therefore touching reprobates," he concludes, must be of "a consequent will."[148]

The major clash between Hooker and the Calvinists, however, occurred a few years afterward in the context, again, of the Temple Church in London. In 1584 Hooker was chosen Master of the Temple, succeeding Richard Alvey, who had held the important post from even before Corro's time there. And almost immediately he found himself involved in a series of theological disputes with the afternoon lecturer, Walter Travers, a leading Puritan divine and himself a strong candidate for the vacancy just filled.

---

[147] Included in Richard Hooker, The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker, with an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton, ed. John Keble, rev. Richard W. Church and Francis Paget (7th ed.; 3 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1888), I, 22-23.

[148] Hooker, "Fragments of an Answer to the Letter of Certain English Protestants," The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker, II, 573, 574-75, 576.

Travers took particular exception with certain of Hooker's views related to the doctrine of predestination. These he took it upon himself to answer regularly in his afternoon lectures, following Hooker's sermons in the morning. To such an extent did this become the pattern that the church historian Thomas Fuller was led to comment that the Temple pulpit "spake pure Canterbury in the morning and Geneva in the afternoon."[149]

The end result of the controversy, after the failure of a number of conferences between the two disputants, was the intervention of Archbishop Whitgift and the ultimate silencing and suspension of Travers. Although the invalidity of Travers' non-episcopal ordination was the pretext used for action, there was never any question but what the real issue was the matter of the theological differences in general, and perhaps Travers' dogmatic attitude in particular.

Following his suspension Travers addressed a rather lengthy "Supplication" to the Queen's Privy Council, in which he defended both the validity of his ordination and his dealings with Hooker. Denying that he had "stood evil-affected towards him for his place, or desirous to fall into any controversy with him," he proceeded to enumerate "sundry unsound matters in his [Hooker's] doctrine" which had been particularly offensive. And not the least among these was the accusation that Hooker "had taught certain things concerning predestination otherwise than the Word of God doth."[150]

---

[149] Thomas Fuller, The Church-History of Britain, ed. John Sherren Brewer (6 vols.; Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1845)

To this Hooker replied with an "Answer to the Supplication," which he chose to address to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Making "a plain declaration of my innocency," Hooker pointed out that his opinions had not been "broached in a blind alley, or uttered where none was to hear," but rather had been openly maintained and proven.[151] With this indirect exchange the controversy was for the moment brought to a close.

Travers' chief objections had been related to two of Hooker's Temple sermons in particular: his sermon "On the Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect," and his discourse "On Justification, Works, and How the Foundation of Faith Is Overthrown." Both dating from 1585, they had contained some of Hooker's most characteristic views. In the former of these, while maintaining that the faith of them "which are of God,...when it is at the weakest [is] so strong, that utterly it never faileth," and that Christ's prayer for mankind "is more than sufficient both to strengthen us, be we never so weak, and to overthrow all adversary power, be it never so strong and potent," he nevertheless adds that "we must hourly, continually, be providing and setting ourselves to strive" if "we look to stand in the faith," and that "we have less certainty of evidence concerning things believed, than concerning [things] sensible or naturally perceived."[152] When pressed on the latter point by Travers, who pointed out that Hooker's view was at variance with that of "all churches and good writers," Hooker replied that "his best author was his own reason"--"true, sound, divine reason...proper to that science whereby the things of God are known."[153]

---

[150] Included in The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker, III, 558-59.

[151] Hooker, The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker, III, 570, 576.

Finally, in his "Answer to the Supplication," Hooker in one passage rather succinctly summarized his views on the subject of the controversy:

> We have seen the general inclination of God towards all men's everlasting happiness notwithstanding sin: we have seen that this natural love of God towards mankind, was the cause of appointing or predestinating Christ to suffer for the sins of the whole world: we have seen that our Lord, who made himself a sacrifice for our sins, did it in the bowels of a merciful desire that no man might perish: we have seen that God nevertheless hath found most just occasion to decree the death and condemnation of some: we have seen that the whole cause, why such are excluded from life, resteth altogether in themselves: we have seen that the natural will of God being inclined towards all men's salvation, and his occasioned will having set down the death but of some in such consideration as hath been showed; it must needs follow, that of the rest there is a determinate ordinance, proceeding from the good pleasure of God, whereby they are, and have been, before all worlds, predestined heirs of eternal bliss.[154]

---

[152] Ibid., pp. 470-71, 473-74, 480-81.

[153] Walter Travers, "Supplication Made to the Council," and Hooker, "Answer to the Supplication," The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker, III, 559, 594.

[154] The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker, II, 583-84.

Thus the first decades of Elizabeth's reign saw some rather significant developments with regard to the doctrine of predestination. Indeed, in one sense it saw the culmination of the development of the doctrine in the English Reformation, as by then all the major traditions had been established and represented on the English scene.

Specifically, the early Elizabethan period saw the firm establishment of the moderate predestinarian tradition, as still representing perhaps the central stream of English theology. It also saw, at opposite theological extremes, the continued growth of the Calvinist, and the rapid rise of the anti-Calvinist tendencies--two traditions which clearly came into their own during the period. And what is perhaps most important of all is that no one of these traditions--not even the Calvinist as is so frequently supposed--ever gained a clear ascendency during the period. Rather, as Harry C. Porter points out, "The 'veins of doctrine' ran side by side," "the story of the theology of the Elizabethan Church of England" being "that of a debate, and not of an unchallenged Calvinist oration."[155]

---

[155] Porter, Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1958), p. 287.

# CONCLUSION

By way of summary and conclusion it would seem that three final considerations are in order: an overall evaluation of the significance of the doctrine of predestination for the English Reformation, an analysis of the principal influences bearing upon the development of the doctrine among the English reformers, and a brief look beyond the present study at certain English predestinarian developments of the 1590's and early 1600's, the last with an eye in particular to the bearing of the events herein described upon the interpretation of those later developments.

In the first place one would have to conclude that within the English Reformation the development of the doctrine of predestination was as often peripheral as it was central in importance. The doctrine upon occasion did come to occupy the center stage of English theology, but for the most part such occasions were relatively short in duration. Likewise the doctrine attracted the attention of a number of the major English reformers and thinkers, but again for the most part interest in its exposition tended to prevail among the lesser churchmen and writers of the period.

More specifically in the Henrician and early Edwardian periods treatments of the doctrine not only were few but also were usually brief and quite incidental in character. The first exclusive treatment of predestination in the English Reformation did not see publication until 1550. The pattern through this period was largely one of the appropriation of the doctrine as a component part of the larger systems upon which at this point the English thinkers were dependent.

By the end of the Edwardian period the doctrine was becoming considerably more important for English thought. Activity in this connection picked up noticeably, not only in the sphere of private productions, but in that of public statements and official standards as well. The relative attention given the issue in the official Edwardian formularies, and particularly in the Forty-Two Articles, is perhaps the clearest indication of the greater significance the doctrine was coming to assume.

It was not until the Marian period, however, that the doctrine came fully into its own within the English setting. In that period the predestinarian controversy among the reformers imprisoned for religion had the effect, if only temporarily, of placing the doctrine at the very center of English Protestant theology. No other single issue agitated the imprisoned churchmen nearly so much as predestination.

Nor indeed was it otherwise on the continent among those Englishmen who had chosen to flee Mary's Catholic regime. Among the exiles at Geneva in particular predestination was a constant and central theme.

With the changed circumstances of the early Elizabethan period, a number of other more pressing issues tended to move again into the forefront of English theology. However, interest in the doctrine of predestination did not thereby decline. Rather to the contrary, the Elizabethan period was the setting for some of the more significant predestinarian developments in England--developments which in many ways represented the culmination of the evolution of the doctrine in the English Reformation. By the middle of the Elizabethan reign the continually widening discussion of the doctrine was rapidly making it once again a central issue in English Protestant thought.

In the second place one would further have to conclude that the evolution of the doctrine of predestination in the English Reformation was a development upon which many different influences came to bear. At one point or another English predestinarian thought was influenced by each of the major traditions then in circulation in Protestant Europe. Basically "foreign" in character from the English standpoint, these traditions ranged from the Augustinian through the Lutheran, the Reformed, the Calvinist, and the anti-Calvinist.

And of equal if not greater importance is the fact that in England no one of these traditions ever managed to dominate or gain a clear ascendency over the others. There never emerged what might be called a distinctively "English" position with regard to the doctrine of predestination. Rather the pattern was more one of the successive (and frequently simultaneous) influence of the various traditions at work.

Of these traditions the Augustinian was undoubtedly the most basic and persistent. From the very beginning, in the works of the Henrician exiles and in the Henrician formularies, a close familiarity with Augustine's theology was evident. Frequent quotations from his writings marked the sermons, treatises, and other productions of the period. In the 1550's his influence continued unrestricted. Two distinct English translations of Augustine's predestinarian treatises saw publication during the decade, and the predestinarian works of Bernardino Ochino and Peter Martyr Vermigli, not to mention the various Edwardian formularies, likewise bore the clear and unmistakable imprint of his thought. In the early Elizabethan period the controversy involving John Veron, Robert Crowley, and John Champneys quite literally turned upon the interpretation of Augustine. And the anti-Calvinists, Antonio de Corro and Peter Baro, were in no small way themselves dependent upon Augustine's views. Since the writings of Augustine had been held in high regard in England even from before the Reformation, perhaps it was quite natural that his predestinarian views should so consistently find representation in the theology of the English reformers.

So basic indeed was Augustine's influence in England that it probably would not be stretching the matter too much to claim that the circulation of the other traditions active in English predestinarian thought was to a great extent facilitated by the widespread reverence felt for the authority of the Bishop of Hippo. This may well have been the case with the Lutheran tradition. For at one and the same time the

Henrician exile group, the only English thinkers influenced to any significant degree by Lutheran theology, was dependent upon both sources of thought. William Tyndale not infrequently alternated quotations from Augustine with material borrowed directly from Martin Luther. And the same was true to a lesser extent of most of his associates in the early Reformation period.

Closely related in terms of English influence to both the Augustinian and the Lutheran was the moderate Reformed tradition. The translation toward the end of the Henrician period of Erasmus Sacerius, basically a Melanchthonian in theology, early provided English representation of the tendency. In the Edwardian period the writings of John Hooper, who borrowed directly from both Philip Melanchthon and Heinrich Bullinger, as well as those of Ochino and Vermigli served to continue and expand the influence. And once again, the moderate Reformed tradition was one of the key influences bearing upon the Edwardian formularies. In the Marian period John Bradford was closely akin, though not so openly dependent upon, the tradition. And much the same was true of a number of the more moderate churchmen and reformers in the time of Elizabeth.

It was the influence of these earliest traditions, each of which shared in common a basically moderate approach to the issues relating to predestination, which laid the foundations for the broad tendency of caution and moderation which became so typical of the English attitude toward the doctrine. If any position came close to dominating predestinarian thought in England during the Reformation it was this broader tendency, clearly the product of multiple influences. From the Henrician period through the Elizabethan the tendency represented a central if not dominant stream of English thought.

There were also other influences at work on the English scene, however--influences which represented departures in opposing directions from this basically moderate position. Of these the Calvinist tradition was undoubtedly the most important. As early as the Edwardian period there were hints and suggestions of a Calvinist influence in England, particularly in connection with the work of Bartholomew Traheron and perhaps that of Ochino and Vermigli again. And in the Marian prison setting Augustine Bernhere and John Philpot were associated with the tradition. But it was within the context of the Marian exile, and particularly among the Genevan exiles, that the first really determinative influence of Calvinism was manifested. The Genevan translation of the Bible, William Whittingham's translation of Theodore de Beza, and the works of Anthony Gilby and John Knox were each in their own way heavily dependent upon Calvinist sources. Under Elizabeth the tradition continued to gain ground, aided by such related developments as the return of the Marian exiles and the rise of the Puritan party. In the early part of that period the controversial works of John Veron and Robert Crowley, the theological confessions of John Field and Thomas Wilcox, the additions to and revisions of the Geneva Bible, and the publication of English translations of certain of the predestinarian works of John Calvin, Beza, and other continental theologians each played a part in the expansion of the influence. By the middle of Elizabeth's reign the Calvinist tradition had clearly established itself as one of the major influences upon English predestinarian thought.

At the opposite extreme was the anti-Calvinist tradition, also a significant factor in Reformation England. Less clearly defined than the others perhaps, this tradition was foreshadowed in its influence by the rise in the Edwardian and the Marian periods of the probably indigenous Freewill movement--a development representing the first outright rejection of the doctrine of predestination in the English Reformation. The treatise attributed to Robert Cooke in the Marian period was the first specifically anti-Calvinist production to come out of the English setting, and it was probably the most powerful indictment of the Calvinist position to be produced by the English Reformation as well. Cooke may well have been influenced by the ideas of Sabastian Castellio, the celebrated continental anti-Calvinist thinker. In the time of Elizabeth the tradition counted numerous additional representatives. The works of Champneys, Samuel Harsnett, Corro, Baro, and Richard Hooker each gave expression to the tradition.

It was in connection with the influence of these last two traditions, at either extreme of the theological spectrum, that the dialogue structure so crucial in the development of the doctrine in England began to emerge. Beginning with the Cooke-Knox exchange and going through the early Elizabethan controversy involving Champneys, Veron, and Crowley, the exchanges between Corro and Baro and their respective Calvinist opponents, and the debate between Hooker and Walter Travers, a Calvinist-anti-Calvinist dialogue gradually established itself as a key pattern--and perhaps the most significant one--in English predestinarian thought.

Surveying these various influences, one begins to see, at least as regards the development of the doctrine of predestination, something of what Owen Chadwick may have had in mind when he asserted that "During the whole of what might be called the formative period of reformed theology there is not something which one might call an English school of theology, but only English theologians influenced by Wittenberg, or Zurich, or Geneva, or Strasbourg."[1] The possible (and probable) exception in this case, of course, is the anti-Calvinist tradition, the closest approximation to a native school within this context.

Finally, it goes almost without saying that predestination continued to be an important issue in English thought well beyond the 1580's. The significance of the issue in fact tended to increase rather than diminish with the lapse of the Elizabethan period. And although the 1590's and the early 1600's represent something of a new and different era in this regard, the developments of the later period were in no small way related to those narrated in this study.

---

[1] Owen Chadwick, "The Sixteenth Century," The English Church and the Continent, ed. Charles Reginald Dodwell (London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1959), p. 61.

It is perhaps to be expected therefore that the findings of the present study should have a bearing upon the interpretation of the subsequent development of the doctrine. Indeed, new light would appear to have been thrown upon at least two key aspects of the later period. Adjustments of interpretation may be required in particular in connection with the question of the relative status of the Calvinist assertion in the late Elizabethan period on the one hand, and with regard to the problem of the origins of the liberal theological movement which was to become so important in the seventeenth century on the other.

The most commonly accepted interpretation of the position of the Calvinist doctrine in the last years of Elizabeth has been that it was clearly dominant in English predestinarian thought. Philip Hughes, a recent historian of the English Reformation, refers to "the last years of Elizabeth's long reign" as being an age when "Calvin's dictum...towered over every man's life."[2] A century earlier Charles A. Hardwick "confidently affirmed" that "during an interval of nearly thirty years [during the Elizabethan period] the more extreme opinions of the school of Calvin, not excluding his theory of irrespective reprobation, were predominant in almost every town and parish."[3] And a host of other reputable scholars have in similar fashion maintained the same basic idea.[4]

---

[2] Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England (3 vols.; London: Hollis and Carter, 1954-56), III, 231.

[3] Hardwick, A History of the Articles of Religion, p. 164.

There was, to be sure, a surge of Calvinist activity in this regard toward the end of the century. With such distinguished and confessed Calvinists as William Whitaker, Robert Some, and William Perkins developing the Calvinist doctrine in all its rigidity, the tradition was bound to make advances. It undoubtedly came to dominate within Puritan circles. But in the light of this study one would have to question any claims of absolute ascendency. The non-Calvinist traditions were just too well established in Elizabethan thought to be so easily and so quickly overcome.

The issue comes to a head in particular at the point of the interpretation of the controversies concerning predestination which racked Cambridge University in the mid-1590's. Some of the details of Peter Baro's involvement in the affair have already been mentioned. The other important figure, and actually the person who precipitated the disputes in the first place, was William Barrett, one of Baro's pupils and a vigorous opponent of the Calvinist doctrine. As a result of a sermon preached *ad clerum* by Barrett at Great St. Mary's Church in 1595--a sermon in which both the Calvinists and their doctrine were severely criticized and attacked--an all-out effort was launched by the Cambridge Calvinists to impose the Calvinist doctrine of predestination upon the university community (and later the English Church at large) as the only official and authorized version of the doctrine. The culmination of the controversy came with the drafting the same year of a strongly Calvinistic document intended by the Calvinists to become a supplement to the Thirty-Nine Articles. The "Lambeth Articles," as the document came to be known, made specific and clear what in the seventeenth article of the official formulary had been left somewhat vague. After weeks of discussion, however--and after the passing of some of the key personalities involved--the issue gradually receded into the background.

---

[4] *Cf.*, William Cunningham, *The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation* (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1866), p. 168; John Dowden, *Outlines of the History of the Theological Literature of the Church of England, from the Reformation to the Close of the Eighteenth Century* (The Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1896-97; London: S.P.C.K., 1897), p. 64; Archibald H. W. Harrison, *Arminianism* (London: Duckworth, 1937), p. 122; and Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, I, 604.

The traditional interpretation of these events has been along the lines of a dominant and reigning Calvinism challenged for the first time by an upstart handful of "Pelagian" rebels. Hughes refers to the Cambridge disputes in general as "the first faint signs of reaction" against Calvinism in England, and the the Lambeth Articles as "normal Anglicanism on this point and at this moment."[5] However, the evidence of this study would seem to confirm a different and more recent interpretation--one put forward in particular by H. C. Porter.[6] The controversies are probably most accurately viewed as a mere continuation of the pattern of dialogue and debate between the Calvinists and the anti-Calvinists which had been evolving in English predestinarian thought over the previous half century. In the words of Porter, "The disputes of the 1590's in the university must be interpreted not as a study of reigning and resplendent Calvinism challenged by upstart Arminianism, but as the rearguard action of one important party on seeing another important party beginning to capture a little too much territory, upsetting, as it were, the theological balance of power."[7] The Calvinist failure at Cambridge--and they did in the final analysis fail to achieve their primary objectives--is attributable precisely to the impressive, though not surprising, display of strength exhibited by the considerable non-Calvinist forces within the English Church.

---

[5] Hughes, The Reformation in England, III, 231, 234.

[6] Cf., Porter, Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge, pp. 277ff.; and Porter, "The Anglicanism of Archbishop Whitgift," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XXXI, No. 2 (June, 1962), 127-41.

Not altogether unrelated to the above is the problem of the origins of the liberal theological movement which was to come into its own in England during the first half of the seventeenth century. Associated with such groups as the Latitudinarians, the Platonists, and the Laudians or High Churchmen, and characterized among other things by an anti-Calvinist approach to the problems related to predestination, the movement has for the most part been known to historians by the label "Arminianism." It was to be especially important in setting the tone for much of subsequent English theology.

As the label itself might suggest, the origins of the liberal movement in England have traditionally been associated with the influence of the seventeenth-century Dutch theological movement of the same name. It has generally been assumed that the influence of Jacob Arminius, the initiator of the movement in Holland, and of his disciples provided the primary and initial impulse for the tendency in England. However, in this case no less than before it would appear that in the light of this study an adjustment of interpretation may be required. The evidence of this study would suggest that the Arminian movement in England may have been rather more indigenous in origin than has heretofore been allowed. It would suggest that the origins of the movement may well lie, at least in part, in the work of those English anti-Calvinist thinkers whose ideas anticipated, in some cases by as much as a half century, the work of Arminius himself. Indeed one of the primary achievements of the study has been to show that there were in England "Arminians" long before Arminius himself came into prominence across the Channel. The study would suggest then that the Dutch influence in England may well have been not so much a case of making new converts as of simply finding kindred minds.

---

[7] Porter, Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge, p. 287.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary Materials

### Manuscript Sources

Bodleian MS 53, in the Bodleian Library.

Corpus Christi College Library MS 115, in the Corpus Christi College Library, Cambridge.

Harleian MS 421.64, in the British Museum.

### Printed Sources

A., J. [T. Parriett], ed., *An Historical Narration of the Judgement of Some Most Learned and Godly English Bishops, Holy Martyrs, and Others, Concerning God's Election, and the Merit of Christ His Death*. London: B. A. and T. F. for Samuel Nealand, 1631.

Arminius, James, *The Works of James Arminius, D.D., Formerly Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden*, ed. James Nichols. 3 vols.; London: for Longman, *et al.*, 1825-1875.

Askew, Anne, *The First Examinacyon of Anne Askewe, Latelye Martyred in Smythfeld, by the Romysh Popes Upholders, with the Elucydacyon of Johan Bale*, ed. John Bale. [Wesel: D. van der Straten, 1546].

Augustine, Aurelius, *The Anti-Pelagian Works of Saint Augustine, Bishop of Hippo*, trans. Peter Holmes and Robert Ernest Wallis, Vols. IV, XII, XV of *The Works of Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo*, ed. Marcus Dods. 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872, 1874, 1876.

__________, *Two Bokes of the Noble Doctor and B. S. Augustine, Thone Entiteled of the Predestinacion of Saintes, Thother of Perseveraunce unto Thende, Whereunto Are Annexed the Determinacions of Two Auncient Generall Councelles, Confermyng the Doctrine Taught in These Bokes by S. Aug*[ustine], trans. John Scory. [London?, 1556?].

__________, *A Worke of the Predestination of Saints, Wrytten by the Famous Doctor S. Augustine Byshop of Carthage*, trans. Nycolas Lesse. London: The wydowe of John Herforde for Gwalter Lynne, 1550.

Barnes, Robert, *A Supplicatyon Made by Robert Barnes, Doctoure in Divinite, unto the Most Excellent and Redoubted Prince Kinge Henrye the Eyght*. [Antwerp: S. Cock, 1531].

Baro, Peter, "Fower Sermons and Two Questions, as They Were Uttered and Disputed *ad Clerum* in S. Maries Church and Schools in Cambridge," appended to *A Speciall Treatise of Gods Providence and of Comforts Against All Kinde of Crosses and Calamities To Be Fetched from the Same*, by Andreas Gerardus, trans. J[ohn] L[udham]. London: John Woolfe, [1588?].

__________, *Petri Baronis, Stempani, Sacrae Theologiae in Academia Cantabrigiensi Doctoris ac Professoris in Jonam Prophetam Praelectiones*. London: John Day, 1579.

Becon, Thomas, *The Catechism of Thomas Becon, S.T.P., Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, Prebendary of Canterbury, Etc., with Other Pieces Written by Him in the Reign of King Edward the Sixth*, ed. John Ayre. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1844.

__________, *The Early Works of Thomas Becon, S.T.P., Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, Prebendary of Canterbury, Etc.*, ed. John Ayre. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1843.

__________, *Prayers and Other Pieces of Thomas Becon, S.T.P., Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, Prebendary of Canterbury, Etc.*, ed. John Ayre. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1844.

Beza, Theodore de, *A Booke of Christian Questions and Answers, Wherein Are Set Forth the Cheef Points of the Christian Religion in Manner of an Abridgement*, trans. Arthur Golding. London: W. How, 1572.

__________, *A Briefe and Piththie Summe of the Christian Faith, Made in Forme of a Confession, with a Confutation of All Suche Superstitious Errours, as Are Contrary Thereunto*, trans. R[obert] F[yll]. London: Robert Serll, [1565?].

__________, *A Briefe Declaration of the Chiefe Poyntes of Christian Religion, Set Forth in a Table*. [trans. William Whittingham]. London: David Moptid and John Mather, [1575?].

__________, *The Treasure of Trueth, Touching the Grounde Worke of Man His Salvation, and Chiefest Points of Christian Religion: with a Briefe Summe of the Comfortable Doctrine of God His Providence, Compiled in 38 Short Aphorisms*, trans. John Stockwood. London: for Thomas Woodcocke, 1576.

*The Bible and Holy Scripture Conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament, Translated According to the Ebrue and Greke, and Conferred with the Best Translations in Divers Languages, with Moste Profitable Annotations upon All the Hard Places* [Geneva Version]. Geneva: Rouland Hall, 1560.

*The Bible; That Is, The Holy Scriptures Conteined in the Olde and Newe Testament, Translated According to the Ebrew and Greeke, and Conferred with the Best Translations in Divers Languages, with Most Profitable Annotations upon All the Hard Places and Other Things of Great Importance* [Geneva Version]. London: Christopher Barker, 1587.

*The Bible, Translated According to the Ebrew and Greeke, and Conferred with the Best Translations in Divers Languages, with Most Profitable Annotations upon All Hard Places and Other Things of Great Importance* [Geneva Version]. London: Christopher Barker, 1579.

Bradford, John, *The Writings of John Bradford, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and Prebendary of St. Paul's*, ed. Aubrey Townsend. The Parker Society Publications. 2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1848, 1853.

Bucer, Martin, *Opera Latina*, ed. Francois Wendel. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955-

Bullinger, Heinrich, *The Decades of Henry Bullinger, Minister of the Church of Zurich*, trans. H. I., ed. Thomas Harding. The Parker Society Publications. 4 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1849-1852.

Calvin, John, *A Commentarie upon the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romanes*, trans. Christopher Rosdell. London: for John Harison and George Bishop, 1583.

__________, *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*, trans., with introduction, John Kelman S. Reid. London: James Clarke and Company, Ltd., 1961.

——————, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. John Allen. 7th ed., rev. and corr.; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936.

——————, *The Institution of Christian Religion*, trans. [Thomas Norton]. London: Reinolde Wolfe and Richard Harrison, 1561.

——————, *Joannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*, ed. Guilielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, and Eduardus Reuss. Corpus Reformatorum, XXIX - LXXXVII. 59 vols.; Brunsvigae et Berolinae: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1863-1900.

——————, *Thirteene Sermons of Maister John Calvine, Entreating of the Free Election of God in Jacob, and of Reprobation in Esau*, trans. John Fielde. London: Thomas Dawson for Thomas Man and Tobie Cooke, 1579.

Careless, John, *Certeyne Godly and Comfortable Letters of the Constant Wytnes of Christ John Careles, Written in the Time of His Imprisonment, and Now Fyrste Set Forth in Printe*, [ed. Thomas Pirry]. London: Willyam Powell, 1566.

*Certain Sermons, or Homilies, Appoynted by the Kynges Maiestie, To Be Declared and Redde, by All Personnes, Vicars, or Curates, Every Sonday in Their Churches, Where Thei Have Cure*. London: Rychard Grafton, 1547.

Champneys, John, *The Harvest Is at Hand, Wherin the Tares Shall Be Bound, and Cast into the Fyre and Brent*. London: H. Powell, 1548.

Corro, Antonio de, *A Theological Dialogue, Wherin the Epistle of S. Paul the Apostle to the Romanes Is Expounded*. London: Thomas Purfoote, 1575.

Coverdale, Myles, ed., *Certain Most Godly, Fruitful, and Comfortable Letters of Such True Saintes and Holy Martyrs of God, as in the Late Bloodye Persecution Here Within This Realme, Gave Their Lyves for the Defence of Christes Holy Gospel; Written in the Tyme of Theyr Affliction and Cruell Imprisonment*. London: John Day, 1564.

Cranmer, Thomas, *The Workes of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556*, ed. John Edmund Cox. The Parker Society Publications. 2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1844, 1846.

Crowley, Robert, *An Apologie, or Defence, of Those Englishe Writers and Preachers Which Cerberus the Three Headed Dog of Hell, Chargeth with False Doctrine, Under the Name of Predestination*. London: Henry Binneman, 1566.

__________, *The Confutation of xiii Articles, Whereunto Nicholas Shaxton, Late Bishop of Salisburye Subscribed*. London: John Day, [1548].

Foxe, John, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, ed. George Townsend. 8 vols.; London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1843-1849.

Frere, Walter Howard, and Charles Edward Douglas, eds., *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt*. The Church Historical Society publications. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.

Frith, John, *A Mirrour or Glasse To Know Thyselfe*. [Antwerp?, 1533?].

Fulke, William, *A Defense of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue, Against the Cavils of Gregory Martin*, ed. Charles Henry Hartshorne. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1843.

__________, *Stapleton's Fortress Overthrown, A Rejoinder to Martiall's Reply, And A Discovery of the Dangerous Rock of the Popish Church Commended by Sanders*, ed. Richard Gibbings. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1848.

Gardiner, Stephen, *A Declaration of Suche True Articles as George Joye Hath Gone About To Confute as False*. London: Johannes Herforde for R. Toye, 1546.

__________, *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, ed. James Arthur Muller. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1933.

Gee, Henry, and William John Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1921.

Gilby, Anthony, *A Briefe Treatice of Election and Reprobation, with Certen Answers to the Objections of the Doctrine*. London: David Moptid and John Mather, [1575?].

Grindal, Edmund, *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D.D., Successively Bishop of London, and Archbishop of York and Canterbury*, ed. William Nicholson. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1843.

Haddon, Walter, and John Foxe, *Against Jerome Osorius, Byshop of Silvane in Portingall, and Against His Slanderous Invectives: An Aunswere Apologeticall, for the Necessary Defence of the Evangelicall Doctrine and Veritie*, trans. James Bell. London: John Daye, 1581.

Harsnett, Samuel, "A Sermon Preached at S. Pauls Cross in London," appended to *Three Sermons by Dr. Richard Stewart, Dean of St. Paul's*, by Richard Stewart. 2nd ed.; London: for Gabriel Bedel and T. Collins, 1658.

*The Holie Bible, Conteynyng the Olde Testament and the New* [Bishops' Version]. London: Richarde Jugge, [1568].

Hooker, Richard, *The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker, with an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton*, ed. John Keble, rev. Richard W. Church and Francis Paget. 7th ed.; 3 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1888.

Hooper, John, *Early Writings of John Hooper, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, Martyr, 1555*, ed. Samuel Carr. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1843.

__________, *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper, Together with His Letters and Other Pieces*, ed. Charles Nevinson. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1852.

Hutchinson, Roger, *The Works of Roger Hutchinson, Fellow of St. John's College, and Afterwards of Eton College*, ed. John Bruce. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1842.

Jewel, John, *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, ed. John Ayre. The Parker Society Publications. 4 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1845-1850.

Joye, George, *George Joye Confuteth Winchesters False Articles*. Wesill in Cliefe Lande [Antwerp?], 1543.

__________, *The Refutation of the Byshop of Winchesters Derke Declaration of His False Articles, Once Before Confuted by George Joye*. [London: J. Herford], 1546.

Ketley, Joseph, ed., *The Two Liturgies, A. D. 1549, and A. D. 1552, with Other Documents Set Forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI*. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1846.

Knox, John, *The Works of John Knox*, ed. David Laing. 5 vols.; Edinburgh: The Wodrow Society and the Bannatyne Club, 1846-1864.

Lamberd, John, *Of Predestinacion & Election*. Canterbury: J. Mychell, 1550.

Latimer, Hugh, *Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555*, ed. George Elwes Corrie. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1845.

__________, *Sermons by Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555*, ed. George Elwes Corrie. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1844.

Laurence, Richard, ed., *Authentic Documents Relative to the Predestinarian Controversy, Which Took Place Among Those Who Were Imprisoned for Their Adherence to the Doctrines of the Reformation by Queen Mary*. Oxford: W. Baxter, 1819.

Lloyd, Charles, ed., *Formularies of Faith Put Forth by Authority During the Reign of Henry VIII*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1825.

Melanchthon, Philip, *Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*, ed. Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider. Corpus Reformatorum, I-XXVIII. 28 vols.; Halis Saxonum, Brunsvigae: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1834-1860.

Miller, Perry, and Thomas H. Johnson, eds., *The Puritans; A Sourcebook of Their Writings*. Rev. ed.; 2 vols.; New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.

Musculus, Wolfgang, *Commonplaces of Christian Religion, Gathered by Wolfgangus Musculus, for the Use of Suche as Desire the Knowledge of Godly Truthe*, trans. [John Man]. London: Reginald Wolfe, 1563.

Nowell, Alexander, *A Catechism, Written in Latin, by Alexander Nowell, Dean of St Paul's; Together with the Same Catechism Translated into English by Thomas Norton*, ed. George Elwes Corrie. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1853.

Ochino, Bernardino, *Fouretene Sermons of Bernardine Ochyne, Concernyng the Predestinacion and Eleccion of God, Very Expediente to the Settynge Forth of Hys Glorye Among Hys Creatures*, trans. A[nn?] C[ooke]. London: John Day and William Seres, [1550?].

Parker, Matthew, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. John Bruce. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1853.

*A Parte of a Register, Contayninge Sundrie Memorable Matters, Written by Divers Godly and Learned in Our Time, Which Stand for, and Desire the Reformation of Our Church*. [Middelburg: R. Schilders, 1593].

Philpot, John, *The Examinations and Writings of John Philpot, B.C.L., Archdeacon of Winchester, Martyr, 1555*, ed. Robert Eden. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1842.

Pilkington, James, *The Works of James Pilkington, B.D., Lord Bishop of Durham*, ed. James Scholefield. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1842.

[Ponet, John?], *The Humble and Unfained Confession of the Belefe of Certain Poore Banished Men, Grounded upon the Holy Scriptures of God, and Upon the Articles of That Undefiled and Onlye Undoubted True Christian Faith, Which the Holy Catholicke (That Is To Say Universal) Churche of Christ Professeth*. Wittonburge [Antwerp?]: Nicholas Dorcaster, 1554.

*The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws, as Attempted in the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth*, ed. Edward Cardwell. New ed.; Oxford: The University of Oxford Press, 1850.

Ridley, Nicholas, *The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D., Sometime Lord Bishop of London, Martyr, 1555*, ed. Henry Christmas. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1841.

Robinson, Hastings, ed., *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, Written During the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary*. The Parker Society Publications. 2 pts.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1846, 1847.

__________, ed., *The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with Some of the Helvetian Reformers During the Early Part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. The Parker Society Publications. 2 pts.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1842, 1846.

Rogers, Thomas, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England: An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, ed. John James Stewart Perowne. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1854.

Sandys, Edwin, *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, D.D., Successively Bishop of Worcester and London, and Archbishop of York, to Which Are Added Some Miscellaneous Pieces by the Same Author*, ed. John Ayre. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1841.

Sarcerius, Erasmus, *Commonplaces: A Compendyous Forme of Teachyng or Discyplyne Declarynge the Common and Pryncypall Places of Our Chrysten Relygion*, trans. Richard Tavener. London: Johan Byddell, 1538.

Schaff, Philip, *Bibliotheca Symbolica Ecclesiae Universalis: The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes*. 3 vols.; 6th ed., rev. and enl.; New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1931.

*The Seconde Parte of a Register, Being a Calendar of Manuscripts Under That Title Intended for Publication by the Puritans About 1593, and Now in Dr Williams' Library, London*, ed. Albert Peel. 2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1915.

Skelton, John, *Here After Foloweth a Litel Boke Called Colyn Cloute*. n.p.: R. Kele, [1545?].

Traheron, Bartholomew, *An Exposition of the 4 Chap. of S. Joans Revelation, Made by Bar[tholomew] Traheron in Sondrie Readings Before His Countre Men in Germanie, Wherein the Providence of God Is Treated with an Answer Made to the Objections of a Gentle Adversarie*. [Zurich?: C. Froschauer?], 1557.

Tyndale, William, *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue, The Supper of the Lord After the True Meaning of John VI and I Cor. XI, and Wm. Tracy's Testament Expounded*, ed. Henry Walter. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1850.

__________, *Doctrinal Treatises, and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures*, ed. Henry Walter. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1848.

Vermigli, Peter Martyr, *The Common Places of the Most Famous and Renowned Divine Doctor Peter Martyr*, trans. Anthonie Marten. London: Henrie Denham, Thomas Chard, William Broome, and Andrew Maunfell, 1583.

__________, *Most Learned and Fruitfull Commentaries of D. Peter Martir Vermilius Florentine, Professor of Divinitie in the Schole of Tigure, Upon the Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes*, trans. H. B[olton?]. London: John Day, 1568.

Veron, John, *A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination and of the Divine Providence of God, with an Apology of the Same, Against the Swynyshe Gruntinge of the Epicures and Atheystes of Oure Time*. London: John Tisdale, [1561?].

__________, *A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination, and of the Devyne Providence of God, as Far [Set] Forth as the Holy Scriptures and Word of God Shal Lead Us*. London: John Tisdale, [1561].

__________, *A Moste Necessary Treatise of Free Wil, Not Onlye Against the Papistes, but also Against the Anabaptists, Which in These Our Daies, Go About To Renue the Detestable Heresies of Pelagius, and of the Luciferians*. London: John Tisdale, [1561].

Whitgift, John, *The Works of John Whitgift, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Dean of Lincoln, Etc.*, ed. John Ayre. The Parker Society Publications. 3 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1851.

Whittingham, William, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort, 1554-1558 A. D.*, ed. Edward Arber. London: Elliot Stock, 1908.

Woolton, John, *The Christian Manual; or, Of the Life and Manners of True Christians*. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1851.

## Secondary Materials

### Books

Allen, John, *The Fathers, the Reformers, and the Public Formularies of the Church of England*. Amer. ed.; Philadelphia: Philip H. Nicklin, 1817.

Bailey, Derrick Sherwin, *Thomas Becon and the Reformation of the Church in England*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1952.

Bainton, Roland H., *The Travail of Religious Liberty: Nine Biographical Studies*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.

Baird, Henry Martyn, *Theodore Beza, the Counsellor of the French Reformation, 1519-1605*. Heroes of the Reformation series. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899.

Barry, Alfred, ed., *Masters in English Theology*. London: J. Murray, 1877.

Benrath, Karl, *Bernardino Ochino, of Siena: A Contribution Towards the History of the Reformation*, trans. Helen Zimmern. London: James Nisbet and Company, 1876.

Bicknell, Edward J., *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1947.

Bindoff, Stanley T., *Tudor England*, Vol. V of *The Pelican History of England*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959.

Black, John Bennett, *The Reign of Elizabeth, 1558-1603*, Vol. VIII of *The Oxford History of England*, ed. Sir George Clark. 2nd ed.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959.

Blench, J. W., *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English Sermons, 1450-c.1600*. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1964.

Blunt, John Henry, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer; Being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1908.

__________, *The Reformation of the Church of England; Its History, Principles, and Results*. 5th ed.; 2 vols.; London: Revington's, 1882.

Boettner, Loraine, *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1932.

Booty, John Everitt, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England*. The Church Historical Society publications. London: S.P.C.K., 1963.

Bromiley, Geoffrey William, *Thomas Cranmer Theologian*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1956.

Bronkema, Ralph, *The Essence of Puritanism*. Goes, Holland: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, [1929].

Brook, Victor John Knight, *A Life of Archbishop Parker*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962.

__________, *Whitgift and the English Church*. Teach Yourself History Library. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957.

Brown, William James, *The Life of Rowland Taylor, LL.D., Rector of Hadleigh in the Deanery of Bocking*. London: The Epworth Press, 1959.

Browne, Edward Harold, *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, Historical and Doctrinal*. 12th ed.; London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1882.

Buis, Harry, *Historic Protestantism and Predestination*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1958.

Burnet, Gilbert, *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*, rev. and corr. James R. Page. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1850.

__________, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, ed. Nicholas Pocock. New ed., rev.; 7 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1865.

Burrage, Champlin, *The Early English Dissenters, in the Light of Recent Research (1550-1641)*. 2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1912.

Butterworth, Charles C., *The English Primers (1529-1545); Their Publication and Connection with the English Bible and the Reformation in England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953.

__________, *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340-1611*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941.

__________, and Allan G. Chester, *George Joye, 1495?-1553: A Chapter in the History of the English Bible and the English Reformation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962.

Carpenter, Spencer C., *The Church in England, 597-1688*. London: John Murray, 1954.

Carré, Meyrick H., *Phases of Thought in England*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1949.

Carter, Charles Sydney, *The Anglican Via Media, Being Studies in the Elizabethan Religious Settlement and in the Teaching of the Caroline Divines*. London: Chas. J. Thynne and Jarvis, Ltd., 1927.

__________, *The English Church and the Reformation*. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1912.

Cattermole, Richard, *The Literature of the Church of England, Indicated in Selections from the Writings of Eminent Divines, with Memoirs of Their Lives, and Historical Sketches of the Times in Which They Lived*. 2 vols.; London: J. W. Parker, 1844.

Chester, Allan G., *Hugh Latimer, Apostle to the English*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954.

Clark, Henry W., *History of English Nonconformity, from Wyclif to the Close of the Nineteenth Century*. 2 vols.; London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1911, 1913.

Clark, William, *The Anglican Reformation*, Vol. X of *Ten Epochs of Church History*, ed. John Fulton. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1897.

Clebsch, William A., *England's Earliest Protestants, 1520-1535*. Yale Publications in Religion, No. 11. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

Collins, William Edward, ed., *Typical English Churchmen, from Parker to Maurice: A Series of Lectures*. The Church Historical Society publications, LXV. London: S.P.C.K., 1902.

Constant, Gustave, *The Reformation in England*, trans. Robert E. Scantlebury and Edward I. Watkin. 2 vols.; London: Sheed and Ward, 1939, 1942.

Cremeans, Charles Davis, *The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England*. Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, XXXI, No. 1. Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1949.

Cunningham, William, *Historical Theology: A Review of the Principal Doctrinal Discussions in the Christian Church Since the Apostolic Age*. Students' Reformed Theological Library. 4th ed.; 2 vols.; London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1960.

__________, *The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation*. 2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1866.

Cutts, Edward L., *Turning Points of English Church History*. London: S.P.C.K., 1892.

Dalton, Hermann, *John A Lasco; His Earlier Life and Labours: A Contribution to the History of the Reformation in Poland, Germany, and England*, trans. Maurice J. Evans. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1886.

Darby, Harold S., *Hugh Latimer*. London: The Epworth Press, 1953.

Dawley, Powel Mills, *John Whitgift and the English Reformation*. The Hale Lectures, 1953. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.

Demaus, Robert, *Hugh Latimer: A Biography*. New ed.; London: The Religious Tract Society, [1903].

Dickens, Arthur Geoffrey, *The English Reformation*. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

Dillenberger, John, and Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity, Interpreted Through Its Development*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.

Dixon, Richard Watson, *History of the Church of England, from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction*. 2nd ed., rev.; 6 vols.; London: George Routledge and Sons, 1884-1903.

Dodwell, Charles Reginald, ed., *The English Church and the Continent*. London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1959.

Doernberg, Erwin, *Henry VIII and Luther; An Account of Their Personal Relations*. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1961.

Dowden, Edward, *Puritan and Anglican: Studies in Literature*. 3rd ed.; London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company, Ltd., 1910.

Dowden, John, *Outlines of the History of the Theological Literature of the Church of England, from the Reformation to the Close of the Eighteenth Century*. The Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1896-97. London: S.P.C.K., 1897.

Eadie, John, *The English Bible: An External and Critical History of the Various English Translations of Scripture*. 2 vols.; London: Macmillan and Company, 1876.

Eason, Charles, *The Genevan Bible; Notes on Its Production and Distribution*. Dublin: Eason and Son, Ltd., 1937.

Eells, Hastings, *Martin Bucer*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931.

Elliott-Binns, Leonard, *The Reformation in England*. Duckworth's Theology Series. London: Duckworth, 1937.

Fisher, George Park, *History of Christian Doctrine*. The International Theological Library. 2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1949.

Frere, Walter Howard, *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1558-1624)*, Vol. V of *A History of the English Church*, ed. William R. W. Stephens and William Hunt. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1904.

__________, *The Marian Reaction in Its Relation to the English Clergy: A Study of the Episcopal Registers*. The Church Historical Society publications, XVIII. London: S.P.C.K., 1896.

Fuller, Thomas, *The Church-History of Britain*, ed. John Sherren Brewer. 6 vols.; Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1845.

Gairdner, James, *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary*, Vol. IV of *A History of the English Church*, ed. William R. W. Stephens and William Hunt. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1902.

Garrett, Christina Hallowell, *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism*. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1938.

Gasquet, Francis A., *The Eve of the Reformation: Studies in the Religious Life and Thought of the English People in the Period Preceding the Rejection of the Roman Jurisdiction by Henry VIII*. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1927.

George, Charles H., and Katherine George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Gibson, Edgar C. S., *The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, Explained with an Introduction*. 2nd ed., rev.; London: Methuen and Company, 1898.

Golding, Louis Thorn, *An Elizabethan Puritan: Arthur Golding*. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1937.

Green, Edward Tyrrell, *The Thirty-Nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation; An Historical and Doctrinal Exposition in the Light of Contemporary Documents*. London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Company, 1896.

Greenslade, Stanley Lawrence, *The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.

__________, *The Work of William Tindale*. London: Blackie and Son Ltd., 1938.

Haller, William, *The Elect Nation: The Meaning and Relevance of Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.

__________, *The Rise of Puritanism; or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press, from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Hardwick, Charles A., *A History of the Articles of Religion; to Which Is Added A Series of Documents, from A. D. 1536 to A. D. 1615, Together with Illustrations from Contemporary Sources*, rev. Francis Proctor. 3rd ed., rev.; London: George Bell and Sons, 1876.

Harnack, Adolph von, *History of Dogma*, trans., from the 3rd German ed., Neil Buchanan, *et al.* 7 vols.; New York: Russell and Russell, 1958.

Harrison, Archibald H. W., *Arminianism*. London: Duckworth, 1937.

__________, *The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort*. London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1926.

Haweis, John Oliver Willyams, *Sketches of the Reformation and Elizabethan Age, Taken from the Contemporary Pulpit*. London: William Pickering, 1844.

Henson, Herbert Hensley, *The Relation of the Church of England to the Other Reformed Churches*. The Robert Lee Lecture, 1911. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1911.

Heppe, Heinrich L. J., *The Reformers of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century; Their Intercourse and Correspondence*, trans., with additions, Hermann Schmettau and B. Harris Cowper. London: Hatchard and Company, 1859.

Herr, Alan Fager, *The Elizabethan Sermons: A Survey and A Bibliography*. Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1940.

Heylyn, Peter, *Ecclesia Restaurata; or, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, ed. James Craigie Robertson. The Ecclesiastical History Society publications. 2 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1849.

Higham, Florence, *Catholic and Reformed: A Study of the Anglican Church, 1559-1662*. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.

Holden, William P., *Anti-Puritan Satire, 1572-1642*. Yale Studies in English, CXXVI. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

Hopf, Constantin, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Hudson, Winthrop S., *John Ponet (1516?-1556), Advocate of Limited Monarchy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Hughes, Philip, *The Reformation in England*. 3 vols.; London: Hollis and Carter, 1954-56.

Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe, *Theology of the English Reformers*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1965.

Hunt, John, *Religious Thought in England, from the Reformation to the End of Last Century: A Contribution to the History of Theology*. 3 vols.; London: Strahan and Company, Publishers, 1870-1873.

Hutchinson, Francis Ernest, *Cranmer and the English Reformation*. Teach Yourself History Library. London: The English Universities Press, Ltd., 1961.

Innes, Arthur D., *Cranmer and the Reformation in England*. The World's Epoch-Makers series. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1900.

Jacobs, Henry Eyster, *The Lutheran Movement in England During the Reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, and Its Literary Movements*. Rev. ed.; Philadelphia: G. W. Frederick, 1894.

Jones, Thomas Roberts, ed., *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, by the Reformers; Being Extracts Carefully and Fully Selected from the Works of Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, Hooper, Jewel, Philpot, Pilkington, Coverdale, Becon, Bradford, Sandys, Grindal, Whitgift, Etc*. 2nd ed.; London: Simpkin, Marshall and Company, 1868.

Jordan, Wilbur K., *The Development of Religious Toleration in England, from the Beginning of the English Reformation to the Death of Queen Elizabeth*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1932.

Kipling, Thomas, *The Articles of the Church of England Proved Not To Be Calvinistic*. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1802.

Knappen, Marshall M., *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Knox, Samuel James, *Walter Travers: Paragon of Elizabethan Puritanism*. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1962.

Koch, Karl, *Studium Pietatis: Martin Bucer als Ethiker*. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche, XIV. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.

Lamb, John, *A Historical Account of the Thirty-Nine Articles, from the First Promulgation of Them in MDLIII to Their Final Establishment in MDLXXI*. Cambridge: Deightons, 1829.

Lang, August, *Der Evangelienkommentar Martin Butzers und die Grundzüge seiner Theologie*. Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche, II, No. 2. Leipzig: Dieterich'scher Verlags, 1900.

Laurence, Richard, *An Attempt To Illustrate Those Articles of the Church of England Which the Calvinists Improperly Consider as Calvinistical, in Eight Sermons*. The Bampton Lectures, 1804. 3rd ed., rev. and enl.; Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1838.

Lecler, Joseph, *Toleration and the Reformation*, trans. T. L. Westow. 2 vols.; New York: Association Press, 1960.

Lee, Frederick George, *The Church Under Queen Elizabeth: An Historical Sketch*. New ed.; London: Thomas Baker, 1897.

Lewis, Clive Staples, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama*, Vol. III of *The Oxford History of English Literature*, ed. Frank P. Wilson and Bonamy Dobrée. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1954.

Lindsay, Thomas M., *A History of the Reformation*. The International Theological Library. 2 vols.; 2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1959.

Lorimer, Peter, *John Knox and the Church of England; His Work in Her Pulpit and His Influence upon Her Liturgy, Articles, and Parties*. London: H. S. King and Company, 1875.

Mackie, John Duncan, *The Earlier Tudors, 1485-1558*, Vol. VII of *The Oxford History of England*, ed. Sir George Clark. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957.

Maclure, Millar, *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642*. University of Toronto Department of English, Studies and Texts, No. 6. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Maitland, Samuel Roffey, *Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England*. London: John Lane, 1899.

Malden, Richard H., *The English Church and Nation*. London: S.P.C.K., 1952.

Marsden, John Buxton, *The History of the Early Puritans, from the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War in 1642*. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Company, 1850.

Marshall, John S., *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition: An Historical and Theological Study of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1963.

Martin, Charles, *Les Protestants Anglais Réfugiés à Genève au Temps de Calvin, 1555-1560*. Genève: Librairie A. Jullien, 1915.

Mason, Arthur James, *Thomas Cranmer*. Leaders of Religion series. London: Methuen and Company, 1898.

Maxwell, William D., *John Knox's Genevan Service Book, 1556: The Liturgical Portions of the Genevan Service Book Used by John Knox While a Minister of the English Congregation of Marian Exiles at Geneva, 1556-1559*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1931.

McCulloh, Gerald O., ed., *Man's Faith and Freedom: The Theological Influence of Jacobus Arminius*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

McEwen, James S., *The Faith of John Knox*. The Croall Lectures, 1960. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1961.

McGiffert, Arthur Cushman, *Protestant Thought Before Kant*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.

McNeill, John T., *The History and Character of Calvinism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

__________, *Unitive Protestantism: The Ecumenical Spirit and Its Persistent Expression*. Rev. ed.; Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1964.

Meyer, Carl S., *Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559*. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1960.

Miles, Leland, *John Colet and the Platonic Tradition*. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1962.

Moorman, John R. H., *A History of the Church in England*. New York: Morehouse-Barlow Company, 1959.

Morgan, Edmund Sears, *Visible Saints: The History of A Puritan Idea*. New York: New York University Press, 1963.

Mozley, James B., *A Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*. 2nd ed.; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1878.

Mozley, James Frederick, *John Foxe and His Book*. London: S.P.C.K., 1940.

Muller, James Arthur, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction*. London: S.P.C.K., 1926.

Munz, Peter, *The Place of Hooker in the History of Thought*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1952.

Neal, Daniel, *The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Nonconformists, from the Reformation in 1517 to the Revolution in 1688*, rev. and corr. by John O. Choules. 2 vols.; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1843.

Neill, Stephen, *Anglicanism*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958.

Neisel, Wilhelm, *The Theology of Calvin*, trans. Harold Knight. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.

Neve, Juergen L., *A History of Christian Thought*, with contributions by Otto W. Heick. 2 vols.; Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1946.

New, John F. H., *Anglican and Puritan; The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Norwood, Frederick A., *The Development of Modern Christianity, Since 1500*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Parker, Thomas M., *The English Reformation to 1558*. The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, No. 217. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Patterson, Melville W., *A History of the Church of England*. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1937.

Paule, George, *The Life of the Most Reverend and Religious Prelate John Whitgift, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*. London: T. Snodham, 1612.

Perry, George G., *A History of the Church of England, from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Silencing of Convocation in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1878.

Pollard, Albert Frederick, *Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation, 1489-1556*. Heroes of the Reformation series. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.

Pollard, Alfred W., ed., *Records of the English Bible: The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611*. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.

Porter, Harry Culverwell, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1958.

Powicke, Frederick Maurice, *The Reformation in England*. London: The Oxford University Press, 1961.

Procter, Francis, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of Its Offices*, rev. Walter Howard Frere. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1961.

Prynne, William, *Anti-Arminiamisme; or, The Church of England's Old Antithesis to New Armianisme*. 2nd ed.; London: [T. Cotes], 1630.

Reilly, Bartholomew Michael, *The Elizabethan Puritan's Conception of the Nature and Destiny of Fallen Man*. The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology, Second Series, No. 19. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948.

Ridley, Jasper Godwin, *Nicholas Ridley: A Biography*. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1957.

__________, *Thomas Cranmer*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962.

Routley, Erik, *English Religious Dissent*. English Institutions series. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Rowley, Harold H., *The Biblical Doctrine of Election*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1950.

Rupp, Ernest Gordon, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (Mainly in the Reign of Henry VIII)*. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1947.

Ryan, Lawrence V., *Roger Ascham*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1963.

Schickler, Fernand de, *Les Èglises du Refuge en Angleterre*. 3 vols.; Paris: Librairie Fischbacker, 1892.

Scott, Thomas, *Remarks on the Refutation of Calvinism, by George Tomline*. 2 vols.; London: C. Baldwin for Thomas Scott, 1811.

Scott-Pearson, Andrew F., *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535-1603*. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1925.

Seeberg, Reinhold, *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*, trans. Charles E. Hay. 2 vols.; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1958.

Sellon, Walter, *The Church of England Vindicated from the Charge of Absolute Predestination*. London: E. Cave, 1771.

Sinclair, William Macdonald, *Leaders of Thought in the English Church*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.

Sisson, Charles J., *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker and the Birth of The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1940.

Smith, Herbert Maynard, *Henry VIII and the Reformation*. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1962.

__________, *Pre-Reformation England*. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1963.

Smithen, Frederick J., *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*. London: James Clarke and Company, 1927.

Smits, Luchesius, *Saint Augustin dans l'Oeuvre de Jean Calvin*. Universitas Lovaniensis Facultate Theologica Dissertationes, III, No. 4. 2 vols.; Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V., 1956, 1958.

Smyth, Charles H., *The Church and the Nation: Six Studies in the Anglican Tradition*. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1962.

__________, *Cranmer and the Reformation Under Edward VI*. The Thirlwall and Gladstone Prize Essay, 1925. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1926.

Soames, Henry, *Elizabethan Religious History*. London: John W. Parker, 1839.

Southgate, Wyndham Mason, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*. Harvard Historical Monographs, LXIX. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Stevens, William, ed., *Memoirs of the Life and Martyrdom of John Bradford, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, with His Examinations, Letters, Etc., Arranged in Chronological Order*. London: R. Fenn and T. Stevenson, 1832.

Stoeffler, F. Ernest, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism*. Studies in the History of Religions, IX. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Stow, Thomas Quinton, *Memoirs of Rowland Taylor, LL.D., Archdeacon of Exeter, Rector of Hadleigh, Suffolk*. London: Harjette and Savill, 1833.

Strype, John, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign*. New ed.; 4 vols. in 7: Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1824.

__________, *Ecclesiastical Memorials, Relating Chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of It and the Emergencies of the Church of England, Under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary I*. 3 vols. in 6 pts.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822.

__________, *The History of the Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund Grindal, the First Bishop of London, and the Second Archbishop of York and Canterbury Successively, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821.

__________, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D., the Third and Last Lord Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. 3 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822.

__________, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, the First Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. 3 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822.

__________, *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Wherein the History of the Church and the Reformation of It, During the Primacy of the Said Archbishop, Are Greatly Illustrated*. 2 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1812.

Sykes, Norman, *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: An Essay Towards an Historical Interpretation of the Anglican Tradition from Whitgift to Wake*. *Theology* Occasional Papers, N. S., No. 11. London: S.P.C.K., 1949.

__________, *The English Religious Tradition; Sketches of Its Influence on Church, State, and Society*. Rev. ed.; London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1961.

Symonds, Henry Edward, *The Council of Trent and the Anglican Formularies*. London: The Oxford University Press, 1933.

Taylor, Henry Osborn, *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*. 2 vols.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930.

Thompson, Craig R., *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century*. Folger Booklets on Tudor and Stuart Civilization. Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1958.

Thornton, Lionel S., *Richard Hooker; A Study of His Theology*. English Theologians series. London: S.P.C.K., 1924.

Tjernagel, Neelak Serawlook, *Henry VIII and the Lutherans: A Study in Anglo-Lutheran Relations from 1521 to 1547*. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1965.

Tomline, George, *A Refutation of Calvinism, in Which the Doctrines of Original Sin, Grace, Regeneration, Justification and Universal Redemption Are Explained, and the Peculiar Tenets Maintained by Calvin upon Those Points Are Proved To Be Contrary to Scripture, to the Writings of the Antient Fathers of the Christian Church, and to the Public Formularies of the Church of England*. 5th ed.; London: for Cadel and Davies, 1811.

Tomlinson, John T., *The Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies; Some Forgotten Facts in Their History Which May Decide Their Interpretation*. London: Elliot Stock, 1897.

Tulloch, John, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*. 2 vols.; London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1872.

Vetter, Theodor, *Relations Between England and Zurich During the Reformation*. London: Elliot Stock, 1904.

Wakeman, Henry Offley, *The Church and the Puritans, 1570-1660*. Epochs of Church History series. 5th ed.; London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1897.

Walker, Williston, *A History of the Christian Church*, rev. Cyril C. Richardson, Wilhelm Pauck, and Robert T. Handy. Rev. ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959.

Wand, John W. C., *A History of the Modern Church, from 1500 to the Present Day*. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1957.

Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge, *Calvin and Augustine*, ed. Samuel G. Craig. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1956.

Watson, Philip S., *Let God Be God! An Interpretation of the Theology of Martin Luther*. London: The Epworth Press, 1947.

Wendel, Francois, *Calvin; The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*, trans. Philip Mairet. London: William Collins, Sons and Company, Ltd., 1963.

Whale, John S., *The Protestant Tradition: An Essay in Interpretation*. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1955.

Williams, George Huntston, *The Radical Reformation*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962.

Williams, Norman Powell, *The Grace of God*. The Anglican Library of Faith and Thought. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1930.

Wilson, William Gilbert, and John Herbert Templeton, *Anglican Teaching: An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*. Dublin: Association for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1962.

Winchester, Thomas, *A Dissertation on the XVIIth Article of the Church of England, Wherein the Sentiments of the Compilers and Other Contemporary Reformers on the Subject of the Divine Decrees Are Fully Deduced from Their Own Writings*. New ed.; London: R. Bostock, 1803.

Woodhouse, Hugh F., *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547-1603*. The Church Historical Society publications. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.

Worsley, Frederick William, *The Theology of the Church of England*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1913.

## Articles and Essays

Addison, James Thayer, "Early Anglican Thought, 1559-1667," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, XXII, No. 3 (September, 1953), 247-369.

Bangs, Carl, "Arminius and the Reformation," *Church History*, XXX, No. 2 (June, 1961), 155-70.

Brauer, Jerald C., "Puritan Mysticism and the Development of Liberalism," *Church History*, XIX, No. 3 (September, 1950), 151-70.

Chadwick, Owen, "Arminianism in England," *Religion in Life*, XXIX, No. 4 (Autumn, 1960), 548-55.

Cheyne, Alax C., "The Scots Confession of 1560," *Theology Today*, XVII, No. 3 (October, 1960), 323-38.

Clarke, R. Stuart, "The Theology of Arminius," *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, CLXXXV, No. 4 (October, 1960), 248-53.

Collinson, Patrick, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," pp. 127-62 in *Elizabethan Government and Society: Essays Presented to Sir John Neale*, ed. Stanley T. Bindoff, *et al.* London: The Athlone Press, 1961.

Constant, Gustave, "Le Changement Doctrinal dans l'Église Anglicane sous Edouard VI (1547-1553)," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique*, XXXI, No. 3 (July, 1935), 541-65; XXXII, No. 1 (January, 1936), 24-80.

Cowell, Henry J., "The Sixteenth-century English-speaking Refugee Churches at Geneva and Frankfort," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, XVI, No. 2 (1939), 209-30.

Dauerty, James Shackelford, "The Puritan and the Anglican Spirit," *The Crozer Quarterly*, XIX, No. 2 (April, 1942), 89-97.

Foster, Herbert Darling, "Liberal Calvinism: The Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort in 1618," *Harvard Theological Review*, XVI, No. 1 (January, 1923), 1-37.

Garrett, Christina Hollowell, "John Ponet and the Confession of the Banished Ministers," *Church Quarterly Review*, CXXXVII, No. 273 (October, 1943), 47-74; No. 274 (January, 1944), 181-204.

Greenslade, Stanley Lawrence, "English Versions of the Bible, 1525-1611," pp. 141-74 in *The Cambridge History of the Bible; the West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, ed. Greenslade. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Hall, Basil, "Calvin Against the Calvinists," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, XX, No. 3 (1962), 284-301.

__________, "The Genevan Version of the English Bible," *The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England*, XI, No. 1 (May, 1956), 66-80.

Harrison, Archibald, H. W., "The Church of England Reaction from Calvinism in the Seventeenth Century," *Religion in Life*, XIII, No. 2 (Spring, 1944), 213-23.

Hoenderdaal, Gerrit Jan, "The Life and Thought of Jacobus Arminius," *Religion in Life*, XXIX, No. 4 (Autumn, 1960), 540-47.

Hoffmann-De Visme, Rene, "The Influence of the English Protestant Refugees in Geneva on England in the XVIth Century," *The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England*, VI, No. 1 (May, 1936), 3-20.

Johnson, W. Guy, "Jean Calvin et L'Eglise Anglicane," *Oecumenica*, II, No. 2 (July, 1935), 106-122.

Knappen, Marshall M., "William Tyndale -- First English Puritan," *Church History*, V, No. 3 (September, 1936), 201-215.

Knox, Samuel James, "The Genevan Exiles After the Exile," *The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England*, XI, No. 2 (May, 1957), 89-100.

__________, "John Knox's Genevan Congregation," *The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England*, XI, No. 1 (May, 1956), 3-18.

Krumm, John McGill, "Continental Protestantism and Elizabethan Anglicanism (1570-1595)," pp. 129-44 in *Reformation Studies: Essays in Honor of Roland H. Bainton*, ed. Franklin H. Littell. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1962.

Lang, August, "Martin Bucer in England," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, XXXVIII (1941), 230-39.

Martin, Charles, "De la Genèse des Doctrines Religieuses de John Knox," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Francais*, LV, No. 3 (May-June, 1906), 193-211.

McLelland, Joseph C., "Covenant Theology: A Re-evaluation," *Canadian Journal of Theology*, III, No. 3 (July, 1957), 182-88.

__________, "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination, According to Peter Martyr," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, VIII, No. 3 (September, 1955), 255-71.

McNeill, John T., "Cranmer's Project for a Reformed Consensus," *The Journal of Religion*, VIII, No. 4 (October, 1928), 539-65.

Møller, Jens G., "The Beginnings of Puritan Covenant Theology," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XIV, No. 1 (April, 1963), 46-67.

Muss-Arnolt, William, "Puritan Efforts and Struggles, 1550-1603: A Bio-bibliographical Study," *The American Journal of Theology*, XXIII, No. 3 (July, 1919), 345-66; No. 4 (October, 1919), 471-99.

Norwood, Frederick A., "The Marian Exiles -- Denizens or Sojourners?" *Church History*, XIII, No. 2 (June, 1944), 100-110.

Pearce, E. George, "Luther and the English Reformation," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XXXI, No. 10 (October, 1960), 597-606.

Pocock, Nicholas, "The Condition of Morals and Religious Belief in the Reign of Edward VI," *The English Historical Review*, X, No. 39 (July, 1895), 417-44.

__________, "The Restoration Settlement of the English Church," *The English Historical Review*, I, No. 4 (October, 1886), 677-98.

Porter, Harry Culverwell, "The Anglicanism of Archbishop Whitgift," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, XXXI, No. 2 (June, 1962), 127-41.

Prior, Arthur N., "The Reformers Reformed: Knox on Predestination," *The Presbyter*, IV, No. 1 (February, 1946), 19-23.

Rohr, John von, "Covenant and Assurance in Early English Puritanism," *Church History*, XXXIV, No. 2 (June, 1965), 195-203.

Rupp, Ernest Gordon, "John Bradford, Martyr, Ob. 1 July, 1555," *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, CLXXXVIII, No. 1 (January, 1963), 50-55.

Ryan, Lawrence V., "The Haddon - Osorio Controversy (1563-1583)," *Church History*, XXII, No. 2 (June, 1953), 142-54.

Sargeaunt, W. D., "The Lambeth Articles," The Journal of Theological Studies, XII, No. 46 (January, 1911), 251-60; No. 47 (April, 1911), 427-36.

Southgate, Wyndham Mason, "The Marian Exiles and the Influence of John Calvin," History, N. S., XXVII, No. 106 (September, 1942), 148-52.

Thompson, Beatrice M. Hamilton, "Archbishop Whitgift and the Lambeth Articles," Church Quarterly Review, CXVII, No. 233 (October, 1933), 25-51.

Thompson, Elbert N. S., "Richard Hooker Among the Controversialists," Philological Quarterly, XX, No. 3 (July, 1941), 454-64.

Trinkaus, Charles, "The Problem of Free Will in the Renaissance and Reformation," Journal of the History of Ideas, X, No. 1 (January, 1949), 51-62.

Trinterud, Leonard J., "The Origins of Puritanism," Church History, XX, No. 1 (March, 1951), 37-57.

__________, "A Reappraisal of William Tyndale's Debt to Martin Luther," Church History, XXXI, No. 1 (March, 1962), 24-45.

Warfield, Benjamin Breckenridge, "Predestination in the Reformed Confessions," The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, XII, No. 45 (January, 1901), 49-128.

West, William Morris S., "John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism," The Baptist Quarterly, XV, No. 8 (October, 1954), 346-68; XVI, No. 1 (January, 1955), 22-46; XVI, No. 2 (April, 1955), 67-88.

Yule, George, "Theological Developments in Elizabethan Puritanism," The Journal of Religious History, I, No. 1 (June, 1960), 16-25.

Zuck, Lowell H., "The Influence of the Reformed Tradition on the Elizabethan Settlement," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXI, No. 4 (April, 1960), 215-26.

## Unpublished Theses and Dissertations

Bangs, Carl, "Arminius and Reformed Theology." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.

Gulley, Frank, Jr., "The Influence of Heinrich Bullinger and the Tigurine Tradition Upon the English Church in the Sixteenth Century." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1961.

Huelin, Gordon, "Peter Martyr and the English Reformation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of London, 1954.

Johnston, Philip F., "The Life of John Bradford, the Manchester Martyr, c.1510-1555." Unpublished B.Litt. thesis, University of Oxford, 1963.

Krumm, John McGill, "Anglican Attitudes Towards Continental Protestantism in the Reign of Elizabeth." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1948.

McFadden, William, "The Life and Works of Antonio del Corro (1527-1591)." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Queen's University, Belfast, Ireland, 1953.

Pratt, Melvyn Eugene, Jr., "Zwinglianism in England During the Reign of Elizabeth." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1953.

## Reference Works

"*A Library for Younger Schollers*," *Compiled by an English Scholar-Priest, About 1655*, ed. Alma Dejordy and Harris Francis Fletcher. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XLVIII. Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1961.

Allison, William Henry, *et al.*, eds., *A Guide to Historical Literature*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931.

Bateson, Frederick W., ed., *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*. 5 vols.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941.

The British Museum, *General Catalogue of Printed Books*. Photolithographic ed.; vols.; London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1959-

Case, Shirley Jackson, *et al.*, comps., *A Bibliographical Guide to the History of Christianity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931.

Cooper, Charles Henry, and Thompson Cooper, eds., *Athenae Cantabrigienses*. 3 vols.; Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Company, 1858, 1861, 1913.

Cross, Frank Leslie, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. London: The Oxford University Press, 1958.

Darlow, Thomas Herbert, and Horace Frederick Moule, comps., *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society*. 2 vols. in 4; New York: Kraus Reprint Corporation, 1963.

Davies, Godfrey, ed., *Bibliography of British History; Stuart Period, 1603-1714*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928.

Gillett, Charles Ripley, ed., *Catalogue of the McAlpin Collection of British History and Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York*. 5 vols.; New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1927-1930.

Gough, Henry, ed., *A General Index to the Publications of the Parker Society*. The Parker Society Publications. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1855.

Howe, George Frederick, *et al.*, eds., *The American Historical Association's Guide to Historical Literature*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961.

Jackson, Samuel Macauley, ed., *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1957-1960.

Laurence, Richard, ed., *A General Index to the Historical and Biographical Works of John Strype*. 2 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1828.

Maunsell, Andrew, ed., *The First Part of the Catalogue of English Printed Bookes, Which Concerneth Such Matters of Divinitie, as Have Bin Either Written in Our Owne Tongue, or Translated Out of Anie Other Language, and Have Bin Published to the Glory of God, and Edification of the Church of Christ in England*. London: John Windet, 1595.

Ollard, Sidney Leslie, and Gordon Crosse, eds., *A Dictionary of English Church History*. 2nd ed., rev.; London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, Ltd., 1919.

Pollard, Alfred W., and Gilbert R. Redgrave, comps., *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1956.

Powicke, Frederick Maurice, and E. B. Fryde, eds., *Handbook of British Chronology*. 2nd ed.; London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1961.

Read, Conyers, ed., *Bibliography of British History; Tudor Period, 1485-1603*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959.

Sayle, Charles Edward, ed., *Early English Printed Books in the University Library Cambridge, (1475-1640)*. 4 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1900-1907.

Stephen, Leslie, and Sidney Lee, eds., *Dictionary of National Biography*. 63 vols.; London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1885-1900.

Venn, John, and John Archibald Venn, comps., *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A Biographical List of All Known Students, Graduates and Holders of Offices at the University of Cambridge, from the Earliest Times to 1900*. 4 vols.; Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1922-1927.

Watt, Robert, ed., *Bibliotheca Britannica; or, A General Index to British and Foreign Literature*. 4 vols.; Edinburgh: for Archibald Constable and Company, 1824.

Wing, Donald, comp., *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*. 3 vols.; New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.